DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 902 EC 171 140

AUTHOR Mithaug, Dennis E.; Horiuchi, Chiyo N.
TITLE Colorado Statewide Followup Survey of Special Education Students and Appendices.
INSTITUTION Colorado State Dept. of Education, Denver.; Colorado Univ., Colorado Springs. School of Education.
PUB DATE Sep 83
NOTE 105p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; Employment; *Followup Studies; High Schools; *Special Education; State Surveys; Success; *Vocational Adjustment
IDENTIFIERS Colorado

ABSTRACT

The report discusses a statewide followup survey of 234 special education graduates in Colorado. An initial section, which reviews and summarizes followup research, notes the limitations of past studies and describes the sequence of the Colorado study, from initial efforts (appointment of panel of experts, development of personal interview questionnaire) to pilot testing and conducting interviews and collecting data. Results are summarized in terms of statewide representation, descriptive findings (background information, school information, post school information), and cross tabulations (correlates in high school preparation, regular education, usefulness of regular education, usefulness of vocational education, training needs, sex, age, urban/rural, special education program, and handicapping condition). Among findings were that Ss who were happy with their high school preparation were better adjusted on their jobs after graduation; younger Ss appeared to have been better prepared for post high school adjustments than older Ss; and Ss from resource classrooms exhibited greater occupational successes than respondents from self-contained classrooms or work study programs. Implications are noted, including the need to secure parental cooperation and contribution in the vocational adjustment process. Priorities stressed by respondents for specific vocational skills, as well as social and independent living skills, are noted. Extensive appended materials include a sample survey and detailed survey results. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

EC171140

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Chiyo Horiuchi

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Colorado Department of Education, through the initiative and leadership of Dr. Peter S. Fanning, provided the opportunity and support necessary for conducting a statewide followup of special education graduates. We appreciated the efforts of Dr. Fanning and his staff in making this research possible and for being understanding and supportive of our efforts to meet project deadlines.

We received much valuable input from our panel of experts who guided the direction, format and content of the questionnaire used in the survey. We have acknowledged these efforts by listing the membership of the Followup Survey Panel of the following page.

The interviewers were especially talented and resourceful in contacting and interviewing graduates. Their initiative and professionalism made this study a success. We wish to thank Sue Brookman, Lucia Correll, Cheryl Hilton, Erika Hoyt, Maureen Lawry, Sherwyn Morreale, Deborah Neisen, Carol Sazama, and Theresa Brekke for their contributions.

The staffs of Colorado's administrative units, school districts and special education departments were most helpful in preparing lists of names, addresses, and telephone numbers of special education graduates. Their contributions made this project a statewide cooperative effort.

The office staff of the School of Education at the University of Colorado - Colorado Springs provided the needed support base for conducting the survey and preparing the final report. We wish to thank Evelyn Closson and Connie Wroten for coordinating meetings and preparing reports, Joanne Majors for managing the budget and Carol Janicek for conducting the data analyses.

Finally, we owe a great deal of gratitude to the 234 respondents who agreed to give their time and share their thoughts and experiences with our interviewers. We wish them well and hope that their contributions will provide a basis for increased opportunities for the many students who will graduate from special education programs in the future.

FOLLOWUP SURVEY PANEL

Joan Winfrey
Denver, CO

Bambi Marcantonia
Colorado Springs, CO

Dr. Dennis Hanley
Lakewood, CO

Selwyn Hewitt
Englewood, CO

Asahi Oshima
Boulder, CO

Dr. Bruce Pierce
Fort Collins, CO

Dorothy Andrews
Englewood, CO

Janet Rountree
Aurora, CO

Bari Connelly
Lakewood, CO

Steve Lawrence
Lakewood, CO

Bob Hochhalter
Colorado Springs, CO

John C. Tscharner
Fort Collins, CO

John J. Knipping
Monument, CO

Tom Milan
Greeley, CO

Andrew Nielsen
Greeley, CO

Dr. Robert Sloate
Greeley, CO

Dr. Anthony Carvajal
Greeley, CO

Dr. George Holt
Gunnison, CO

Kenneth McDonald
Grand Junction, CO

Carol Morgan
Larkspur, CO

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

COLORADO STATEWIDE FOLLOWUP SURVEY OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS COMPLETING SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN 1978 AND 1979

Since the passage of PL 94-142 in 1975, there has been a concentrated effort by state and local educational agencies to provide improved instructional opportunities for handicapped students. In many states the Education for All Handicapped Children Act supplements state legislation already in place, such as Colorado's Exceptional Children's Educational Act passed in 1973. Now that there is a commitment to educational opportunities for handicapped children and youth as well as increased educational services to this population in recent years, state agencies can begin to review what they have accomplished and what areas in the service delivery system that might improve. Most states have instituted evaluation systems which report the service delivery activities and costs each year. This information is useful for monitoring compliance to State and Federal laws, and for communicating to the legislature the costs of the services delivered.

In addition to these evaluation activities, which focus primarily upon the present, program directors need to examine the long range outcomes of special education services in order to address such questions as "Does special education make a difference?", "Are handicapped students more employable as a result of their participation in special programs?", "Do students adapt to community living more successfully because of their training in school?" Although these questions are at the crux of attempts to justify expenditures of tax dollars on special programs, they are probably among the most difficult to answer. Methodologically speaking, one can only establish cause and effect relations between a specific practice and a given educational benefit by conducting an experiment. This would require, of course, the random selection and assignment of handicapped children to two educational conditions, one that provides special services and another that does not. Then the researchers could implement the program and follow the two groups over time, measuring specific outcomes repeatedly to note any differences between the two groups at different stages in their post-school adjustment. The ultimate statement of benefit would come by comparing the relative successes of the two groups after graduation. One would expect the group receiving the special services to experience significantly more success than the group that did not. Indeed, this would be a welcome finding. Unfortunately, the critics or skeptics would still question the validity of such a conclusion, claiming, for example, that there were intervening experiences between the school experience and the post-school success that accounted for the differences. If the researchers were unable to demonstrate how they controlled for these extraneous variables (e.g., equalized the experiences across groups in some way), they would be unable to draw the firm cause and effect conclusion that they had intended.

Given such difficulties in designing an adequate experimental study with a longitudinal dimension, to say nothing of the ethical and political obstacles of assigning children in need to a "non-treatment" condition, it is not sur-

prising that there is little conclusive information on educational benefits. Nevertheless, the need for some information about how well handicapped children and young adults adapt after graduation from high school remains. What are they doing? Do they continue their education after school? Do they have jobs? Are they economically self-supporting? Are they happy? Those who continue to press for some information on the possible relationship between school and community adjustment may have to settle for a less rigorous approach, one that relies upon the student's statements regarding past experiences and present situation. This is an important first step in an evaluation process designed to connect, in a correlational format, school experiences and post-school adjustments.

FOLLOWUP RESEARCH

There has been an interest in the social and vocational status of graduates of special education programs since the early 1930s when researchers like Fairbanks (1933) and Baller (1936) examined the adjustments of students formerly diagnosed as mentally retarded. Since then, researchers have continued this line of work, resulting in over 20 followup studies reported in the literature in the past fifty years. Several findings have emerged from these studies which have implications for future research and evaluation of special education programs. The first and possibly most interesting, of course, is the employability of handicapped students after graduation. As indicated from the review, there was a range of 50% to 92% employment rate for the EMR student. The mean rate across all studies was about 80%. One study reported a 27% employment rate for the TMR students and 83% for hearing impaired students. Most of the jobs held by graduates were in the semi-skilled (8.2%-36.4% of graduates, with a mean of 26.7% across studies) and unskilled categories (11.1%-75% of graduates, with a mean of 41.6%). Furthermore, the graduates appeared to be earning at or below the minimum wage which raises questions regarding their financial self-sufficiency.

Those studies reporting the graduates' living status indicated that most were living with their parents and that the frequency of marriage and family responsibilites was somewhat less than for the normal population. Nevertheless, graduates appeared to be mobile with a majority having a driver's license. Studies relating types of high school program to employability and success suggested a possible relationship between the two, although this clearly was not sufficient to indicate cause and effect. The finding, for example, that students who had vocational training did better on the job may reflect selection criteria of the various programs, e.g., the possibility that the more capable students gained access to the vocational program prior to graduation.

A third finding of interest concerns sex differences. Clearly, followup contacts with special education graduates were consistent with known incidences of various handicaps as males were overly represented. Approximately 65% of the special education graduates contacted during the followup studies were males. Another interesting finding in the Dinger (1976) study was the suggestion that female graduates did not receive as adequate preparation as males.

These findings provide a useful baseline for evaluating the outcomes of the present followup study.

THE COLORADO STATEWIDE FOLLOWUP STUDY

In April, 1982, The Colorado Department of Education authorized a followup survey of students completing special education services in 1978 and 1979. A total of 234 graduates from programs in 26

administrative units participated in the study. The procedures and activities followed this sequence: appointment of a panel of experts for advisory purposes, development of a personal interview questionnaire, selection of a sample of respondents, development of interview procedures, selection and training of interviewers, pilot testing of the questionnaire, collection of graduate lists from selected schools, locating of graduates through telephone calls, interviewing graduates, analyzing data, preparation of reports, and dissemination of the reports.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The special education program has been effective in preparing handicapped students for post high school adjustments in the community. This conclusion reflects the attitudes of respondents who indicated that special education classes were more useful than vocational education classes, which were more useful than regular education classes. This is consistent with respondents' positive attitudes about their lives in general.

2. Although most of the graduates of special education programs were employed, their earnings were at minimal levels. Furthermore, most of the respondents lived at home with their parents, suggesting a pattern of financial instability and family dependence cited in earlier research.

3. Respondents indicated a need for more training in specific areas such as social participation and job search and selection.

4. Parents and special education teachers have played significant roles in preparing respondents for the future. In this regard, teachers have been more helpful in finding jobs for respondents than parents. This suggests a need to enlist parental support in preparing students for long term vocational adjustments.

5. The special eduction program appears to be more effective in preparing male students for employment and independence than in preparing female students.

6. Male students, classified as perceptual/communicative disordered and enrolled in resource and regular classes in an urban high school were the most likely to experience postive social and vocational adjustments after high school.

7. In general, the three most frequent predictors of respondents' vocational and social adjustments were: high school experiences (respondents' views on the usefulness of regular and special education, type of special education program experienced in high school, and how well the high school program prepared them to find jobs, work well, and participate in social activities), their sex (male respondents experienced more frequent successes), and support received from parents and relatives.

THE STATEWIDE FOLLOW-UP STUDY

REVIEW OF FOLLOW-UP RESEARCH

The principle method used to gather information on graduates of special education programs was the followup survey conducted through a mailed questionnaire or a personal interview. Over the past 50 years or so, there have been several followup studies of handicapped persons, although most have concentrated on the educable and trainable mentally retarded. Prior to 1950, three followup studies compared EMR and TMR persons who had been enrolled in special classes with non-retarded persons who were enrolled in regular classes. Two of the studies, Fairbanks (1933) and Kennedy (1948) reported little difference between the MR and normal students' post-school adjustment on gainful employment dimensions. On the other hand, a study by Baller (1936) found that gainful employment for MR persons was 30% less than that for the normal controls. All three studies found the MR graduate to be financially dependent upon others. Almost 20 years later, Cassidy and Phelps (1955) conducted a followup study of 19 special education programs within the state of Ohio. This was one of the first and only studies prior to 1983 that surveyed special education graduates throughout an entire state. The authors contacted EMR students (163 males and 105 females) who had been out of school for three to four years. There was an 87% employment rate with 2.3% in skilled occupations, 30% in semi-skilled, 34% in unskilled, 20% in service occupations, 8% in clerical and the remaining in other jobs. At about the same time, Bobroff (1955) followed 121 EMR students (92 males and 29 females) who had been out of school in the Detroit area for about 12 years. He found that approximately 92% were employed with 16.3% in skilled, 36.4% in semi-skilled 29.5% in unskilled, 4.5% in service occupations, and 7.7% in clerical occupations. In another followup of 49 EMR students from Lincoln and Omaha, Nebraska, who had been out of school for six to ten years, Carriker (1957) found that approximately 86% were employed with 4.2% in skilled occupations, 8.3% in semi-skilled jobs, and 75% in unskilled work. Dinger's (1958) followup study of 333 EMR students from Altoona, Pennsylvania, found that about 82% were employed with 16% in skilled, 32% in semi-skilled, 35% in unskilled, 11% in service, and 5% in clerical jobs. In an extensive study of TMR students, Saenger (1957) contacted 520 TMR adults who had attended special classes in New York City. He found that 66% were living with their parents in the community, 26% were in institutions, 73% were unemployed and most were happy and content. In yet another followup study of EMR students who had been out of the Cedar Rapids, Iowa schools for two to nine years, Peterson (1959) found that 77% were employed with only 4.4% in skilled work, while 21.7% were in semi-skilled, 65% were in unskilled, and 8.7% in service occupations. Kennedy (1962) found a higher employment rate in a followup study of EMR students conducted in Connecticut, with about 90% employed in skilled work (32.6%), semi-skilled work (32.0%), unskilled work (11.1%) service occupations (12.3%) and clerical jobs (4.3%).

Since 1960, a number of researchers have analyzed the economic self-sufficiency of the EMR school graduate. Studies by Dinger (1961) and Peterson and Smith (1960) suggest that non-

retarded females outearn retarded males by as much as $1000 per year and the EMR males earned less than the poverty figure of $3000 which was determined by the President's Council of Economic Advisors in 1963. Gozali's 1972 followup of 56 EMR students who had participated in a work study program indicated that 25% were employed, 45% were married and maintaining their own household, 55% were unmarried and living with parents. The average income was $3145, still below the poverty level for that period. Titus and Travis (1973) followed 38 EMR students and confirmed this finding of relatively low economical self-sufficiency, with earnings ranging from $1.40 to $3.85 per hour. Powers (1976) conducted a followup study of 187 hearing impaired students in Pennsylvania and found that 83% were single, 87% had driver's licenses, 68% had part-time jobs, and 60% were satisfied with their high school experience. In 1980, Coonley reported on a followup study of 100 mildly retarded students who had graduated from schools in Northern Kansas and noted that 56% lived with their parents, 30% rented, and 12% owned their own homes, 64% owned their own autos, and 89% were employed in such occupations as food service (30.3%), assembly line work (13.7%), clerical work (11.5%), maintenance (10.3%), sheltered workshop (9.2%), transportation (9.2%), welding (6.9%), and personal services (5.7%). At about that same time, Keim (1979) followed 100 mildly mentally retarded students who had participated in work study programs in the Cleveland public schools and found that while 77% were employed immediately after graduation, only 50% were employed at the time of the followup contact.

In addition to these studies, researchers have also examined the relationship between the type of school program and job success. The results of these efforts are somewhat mixed, although most of the studies clearly indicated some relation. One study found no difference, for example, between self-contained and mainstreamed programs and employability (Collister, 1975), yet another found that the integrated vocational program correlated more highly than the separate or self-contained vocational program with such post-school adjustment indicators as attainment of full-time jobs, occupational level, salary, additional education, money management skills, quality of home, and participation in community activities (Dearborn, 1970). Kernan's (1979) followup study of 92 mildly retarded students in New Jersey is consistent with this latter finding, indicating that the type of special education program appears to have influenced the graduate's post-school self-sufficiency and the types of jobs held. Boyce and Elzey (1978) conducted a followup study of 98 handicapped students in San Francisco, some of whom had received vocational training. Those who had received training were more likely to have a job after graduation and work at a relatively higher occupational level, need less supervision on the job and be more satisfied with their work than those not receiving vocational training. Another study on the relationship between school programs and post-school adjustment followed 183 EMR students who had participated in a work study program, an academic special education program, an external vocational program or an internal vocational program (Dinger, 1973). Significantly more of the successfully employed graduates had participated in the work study program as opposed to any of the remaining three programs. Nevertheless, the unemployment rate for the special education graduate was five times the rate for the normal population. These studies support the general notion that there is a relationship between the type of program the student experiences in high school and his or her post-school adjustment and success.

Finally, there has been some interest in investigating possible relationships between sex and post-school adjustments. Although these efforts have been remarkably modest in their scope and direction, they do highlight an important area of need for descriptive research. Dinger's (1976) study, for example, provided some data that led him to conclude that female

special education students were not receiving adequate training for post-school employment and success. Future research should provide additional data to either support, refute and/or elaborate upon this conclusion.

SUMMARY OF FOLLOW-UP STUDIES

Several findings emerge from past followup studies which have implications for future research and evaluation of special education programs. The first and possibly most interesting, of course, is the employability of handicapped students after graduation. As indicated from the review, there is a range of 50% to 92% employment rate for the mentally retarded student The mean rate across all studies was about 80%. One study reported a 27% employment rate for the TMR student and 83% for hearing impaired students. Most of the jobs held by graduates were in the semi-skilled (8.2%-36.4% of graduates, with mean of 26.7% across studies) and unskilled categories (11.1%-75% of graduates, with mean of 41.6%). Futhermore, the graduates appear to be earning at or below the minimum wage which raises questions regarding their financial self-sufficiency.

Those studies reporting the graduates' living status indicated that most were living with their parents and that the frequency of marriage and family responsibilities was somewhat less than for the normal population. Nevertheless, graduates appeared to be mobile with a majority having a driver's license. Studies relating types of high school programs to employability and success suggested a possible relationship between the two, although relationship was not sufficiently clear to indicate cause and effect. The finding, for example, that students who had vocational training did better on the job may reflect selection criteria of the various programs, e.g., the possibility that the more capable students gained access to the vocational program prior to graduation.

A third finding of interest concerns sex differences. Clearly, followup contacts with special education graduates were consistent with known incidences of various handicaps as males were overly represented. Approximately 65% of the special education graduates contacted during the followup studies were males. Another interesting finding in the Dinger (1976) study was the suggestion that female graduates did not receive as adequate preparation as males.

LIMITATIONS OF PAST FOLLOW-UP STUDIES

Although there has been a significant amount of followup research on the status of graduates of special education programs over the past 50 years, several limitations of the studies' scope and focus prevent a comprehensive analysis and description of the status of graduates in general. The first major issue concerns the type of handicapped students contacted after graduation. Since PL 94-142 passed in 1975, all handicapped children have been eligible to receive special education services. These include the emotionally disturbed, learning disabled and physically handicapped as well as the mentally retarded. Unfortunately, well over 90% of the followup studies of special education graduates have focused primarily upon the mentally retarded and those in turn have concentrated almost exclusively on the educable mentally retarded. Consequently, we know very little about the post school status of students with other handicapping conditions.

A second major difficulty with past studies is that they rarely represent the graduates of more

than a few high schools or a few cities within a given state. Only one study, by Cassidy and Phelps (1955), attempted to reflect the employment status of graduates throughout a state (with interviews of EMR students from 19 special programs). This is an important issue because of known differences between districts in urban, suburban, and rural communities of any state. One may expect, for example, that differences in educational programming and employment opportunities alone would influence post-school adjustment and success.

The third problem concerns the type of information gathered in followup studies. Clearly most, if not all, studies obtained information on the graduates' employment status. After that, however, there is much variation in the data collected. Some studies also requested information on the type of school program the students had experienced and then attempted to relate those data to occupational outcomes, while others focused upon an elaboration of the graduates' community adjustment, determining, for example, the living arrangements, mobility in the community and so forth. It is important to collect both sets of information in order to develop a detailed analysis of the relation between school programs and a variety of post-school adjustment dimensions. In addition, it may be useful to obtain data on the graduates' opinions regarding what school experiences were most and least useful in preparing them for the future.

THE COLORADO STATEWIDE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

On April 1, 1982, the Colorado Department of Education awarded a contract to the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs to conduct a survey of students completing special education services in 1978 and 1979. The survey was to consist of personal interviews with a representative statewide sample of 200 graduates for the 1977-1978 year and 200 graduates for the 1979 year. The sequence of steps described in that contract was as follows:

1. Appoint a panel of experts for advisory purposes.
2. Develop a personal interview questionnaire to include:
   a. background information on special education school experiences;
   b. student responses to their school experiences;
   c. information on the students' vocational/employment status and experiences;
   d. information on the students' socio-economic integration in the community.
3. Select a representative random sample.
4. Develop interview procedures.
5. Select and train graduate students in interview techniques.
6. Pilot test the questionnaire and make necessary changes if needed.
7. Collect graduate lists from selected schools.
8. Conduct telephone follow-up calls to locate graduates.
9. Conduct interviews and collect data.
10. Analyze collected data.
11. Prepare reports to include purpose, method, and project results.
12. Disseminate to all administrative units.

METHOD

The method for conducting the survey followed the sequence of activities listed in the contract with some modification as follows.

APPOINTMENT OF PANEL OF EXPERTS

The panel of experts consisted of special education teachers, vocational education teachers, rehabilitation counselors, school principals, directors of special education, work experience-study coordinators, parents, and faculty from higher education institutions across the state. The panel met three times (two prior and once after the contract start date) to respond to the initial drafts of the questionnaire and give input regarding its scope, direction and content.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PERSONAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

The original personal interview questionnaire was revised several times in response to comments and recommendations made by the panel of experts. The final revised instrument (see Appendix A in the second volume of this report),consisting of a) permission forms to conduct the interview and to gather background information from school records, b) a high school background information sheet, c) student responses to coursework taken at school, d) information on the student's job experiences after leaving school, and e) information on the student's economic status in the community.

SELECTION OF THE REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE

The original plan for selecting a sample was to match the proportion of students graduating from each administrative unit for the year 1978 and 1979. This would assure equal representation throughout all parts of the state. The problem encountered was finding enough students to interview. Consequently, all graduates who could be located and who consented to be interviewed were included in the sample. This ruled out the possibility of obtaining a truly representative sample.

DEVELOPMENT OF INTERVIEW PROCEDURES

The interview procedures consisted of five parts: a) recommended statement and information to include in the first telephone contact to set up the interview, b) opening remarks and information to include upon initial contact with the interviewee, c) directions on advising the student of his or her rights and the signing of permission forms, d) the method of asking questions and recording responses on the interview form, and e) closing remarks to end the interview.

SELECTION AND TRAINING OF INTERVIEWERS

A total of nine interviewers, all female with undergraduate or graduate training in English, special education and/or social work participated in the survey. Initial training for the first group consisted of a) discussions and role-playing of appropriate interview techniques, b) item-by-item interpretation and discussion of the interview questionnaire, and c) practice interviews in the field. Subsequent training of the remaining interviewers included the introductory sessions plus an "apprentice interview" under the supervision of an experienced interviewer. There were periodic meetings with the interviewers to resolve any difficulties in question interpretation that arose during the interviews.

PILOT TESTING OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

As part of the training procedures described above, the interviewers used the questionnaire in several interviews to determine areas of possible difficulty before formally commencing the interviews. Only minor revisions were necessary.

COLLECTION OF GRADUATE LISTS FROM SELECTED SCHOOLS

At the outset of the study, CDE sent requests to each administrative unit for names and telephone numbers of students who graduated in 1978 and 1979. We received lists from 43 administrative units in time to

complete interviews for data analysis. Two units declined to submit lists due to concerns over privacy; and one unit had no data to report.

CONDUCTING TELEPHONE FOLLOW-UP CALLS TO LOCATE GRADUATES

One of the interviewers for the northern and southern sectors each made initial contacts with students. This proved to be difficult. For example, in the Denver area alone where there was a higher concentration of potential interviewees, it took an average of seven calls to different student addresses to set up a single interview. At this ratio, one could have expected to interview a maximum of 203 students (which was actually less than the present total of completed interviews).

CONDUCTING INTERVIEWS AND COLLECTING DATA

The data collection activities were in two parts. The first consisted of the actual interviews at which time the interviewers obtained permission a) to conduct the interview and b) to gather information from the respondent's high school regarding his/her primary handicapping condition, type of special education program, and graduation certificate received (diploma, certificate of completion, etc.). The second phase which commenced after completing most of the interviews consisted of sending copies of the permission forms to the respondent's high school and requesting that the school return the information on his or her handicapping condition, program participation, and official graduation certificate. (See Appendix B in the second volume of the report for the sample form.)

RESULTS

SAMPLE SIZE

The interviewers completed a total of 234 interviews of graduates from 26 administrative units. Although nearly all administrative units submitted names of graduates to be contacted, not all contained phone numbers and many lists had too few names and numbers to allow for a single contact and subsequent interview. The schools returned background information sheets on approximately 80% of those interviewed.

STATEWIDE REPRESENTATION

The sample approximated expected statewide parameters on such characteristics as sex, age, and handicapping conditions. The sample consisted of 65% males and 35% females which is nearly identical to the average sex distributions for surveys conducted in many other states. There is no reason to suspect that Colorado's distribution would be markedly different from that of other states. Colorado does not collect data on sex distribution.

The expected age of the respondents was in the 21 to 23 year range assuming an age of 17 or 18 years during their twelfth year of school. The majority (85%) of the respondents in the sample were within this range with 18% at 21 years, 34% at 22, and 33% at 23 years of age. The remaining 15% ranged from 19 years to 29 years.

The third dimension that is important to match the sample with statewide characteristics is the respondents' primary handicapping conditions. The table below presents the expected and actual proportions of students for the four conditions: mental retardation (MR), perceptual/communication (P/C), emotionally/behaviorally disturbed (EBD), and physical (P). As you can see, the sample was under-represented in the EBD category and over-represented in the physical category. One explanation is the differential dropout rates across conditions, with EBD students being less likely to complete high school. This would result in a reduced proportion of EBD students in the sample.

Proportions of Students with Primary Handicapping Conditions

	MR	P/C	EBD	P
Statewide Expectations	38.4	33.0	16.0	12.0
Actual in Sample	37.0	32.0	12.0	19.0

DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS

A summary of the results of the survey for each major category of questions is in Appendix C of the second volume of this report. All of the findings reported in this section are based upon the data in Appendix C and are significant at or below the .05 level. The findings are in three categories: general background information, school information (including the respondent's view of his/her preparation), and post-school experience.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The following list of findings describes the significant characteristics of the sample of respondents in this survey:

1. Men outnumbered women nearly 2 to 1 with 65% of the sample men and 35% women.
2. The mean age of the respondents was 22.5, the mode 22 and the median 22.4 with a standard deviation of 1.4.
3. The primary handicapping conditions of the respondents approximated the statewide distribution, with the following proportions represented in the sample: MR-37%, EBD-12%, P/C-32%, and Physical-19%.
4. The respondents represented both the urban and rural communities of the state, with 57% from urban and 43% from rural districts. Comparisons with statewide average daily attendance data suggest that the sample may over-represent the rural population of handicapped graduates.
5. The majority of the respondents were single (78%) while the remaining were married (20%) or divorced (2%). Of those married, 61% had one or more children.
6. Nearly all (95%) respondents had no military experience.
7. Most of the respondents (74%) were raised by both their mother and father. Those raised by a single parent were more likely to be raised by mother (16%) than father (7%).

SCHOOL INFORMATION

The following list of findings describes the respondents' school background as well as their reactions and opinions of school experiences.

1. Nearly all of the students attended a high school in the same school district (91%), attended the 12th grade (99%), and received a regular high school diploma (90%).
2. Most of the respondents (80%) declared their major course of study to be vocational as contrasted with college preparatory (20%). Nearly all had taken courses in special education (95%), with lesser proportions taking classes in vocational education (80%) and regular education (77%). Of those taking special education classes, the largest proportion was in a resource classroom (46%) rather than a self-contained classroom (29%) or a work study program (25%).
3. Generally, the respondents indicated that special education (55%) and vocational education (57%) were very useful compared to only 39% who felt the same about regular education classes.
4. The skill areas in which there was a significant difference between respondents' statements about adequate preparation and their need for additional training included:

Skill Area	School Preparation Somewhat to Very Useful	Somewhat to Very Much Need Training Now
a. Getting along with others	79%	56%
b. Understanding own abilities	81%	65%
c. Preparation to perform acceptable work	68%	52%
d. Preparation to search, apply, and interview for jobs	69%	59%

5. The skill areas in which there was no significant difference between adequate preparation in school and current need for skills included:

	Skill Area	School Preparation Somewhat to Very Useful	Somewhat to Very Much Need Trng. Now
a.	Preparation to live independently	67%	68%
b.	Preparation to participate in social/community activities	61%	58%
c.	Knowledge about different jobs	75%	67%
d.	Preparation to select best job for you	58%	64%

6. The persons who were viewed as being most helpful in preparing the respondent for the future were: parents or relatives (78%) and the special education teacher (72%). The vocational education teacher was cited by only 39%, the regular teacher by 34%, job supervisor by 33%, friends by 32%, the coach by 30%, work study teacher by 28%, and other school staff by 27% of the respondents. The remaining persons: the principal/vice principal, Title I teacher, rehabilitation counselor, activities teachers and others were cited by only a few respondents (9-19%) as being important in helping them prepare for the future.

POST SCHOOL INFORMATION

The following list of findings describes the respondents' educational, social, economic, and vocational activities after high school.

1. One half of the respondents (50%) did not report taking any courses after high school. Those who continued their education most often attended classes at a community or junior college (18%), a state college or university (13%) or other (14%). A relatively small proportion (8%) attended a vocational or technical school.
2. One half of the respondents drove a car or motor cycle to get to work and other places. This is an interesting finding, given that only 33% reported having auto insurance. Another significant proportion (16-21%) used the bus.
3. Excluding family contacts due to the respondents' living arrangement (e.g., most lived at home), the most frequent social contacts were with friends who visited less than once per week (24%), between two and four times per week (26%) and more than five times per week (31%). Parents, relatives and others played lesser roles in their social lives. A significant proportion (18%) reported no visits at all from friends. Adding this to those who reported fewer than one visit per week (24%) suggests that a relatively large proportion of the respondents were socially inactive (42%).
4. The largest proportion of respondents (64%) indicated that they lived with their parents or guardians. A small proportion indicated that they had their own home (6%) or lived in an apartment by themselves (8%). A comparable proportion, 63%, indicated that they had not used vocational rehabilitation services.
5. Although the majority (59%) responded that they did not receive money from anyone (parents provided financial support for 19%), there was little indication of significant financial independence or integration within the community, as indicated by 33% of the sample responding that they had no money, 56% specifying that they had a savings account and only 7% indicated they had a checking account; 50% were not making payments on major items (20% were making payments on a car); and 85% paid cash for items rather than using a credit card (7%) or charge account (4%).
6. Most of the respondents held a job at one time since graduation (82%), and many held more than one job. The

average number for the sample was 3.1. However, an approximately equal proportion held as many as 2, 3, 4, or 5 jobs since high school. At the time of the interview 69% of the respondents were working.

7. Since graduation, respondents indicated that the persons responsible for finding them jobs were: self (29%), teacher (16%), and friends (13%). Evidently, parents and relatives were not as influential in this effort. Furthermore, one-third (32%) specified that their jobs were full-time while 29% indicated that the jobs were half or part-time. Also, a proportion (43%) indicated that they typically earned less than $3.00/hour, with 13% specifying less than $4.00/hour. A much larger percentage (35%) had never received a raise with 33% responding that they had received a raise.
8. Generally, graduates responded postively about their jobs. Most (72%) reported no problems during work, while a small proportion indicated that they had difficulty not doing enough work (9%) and the boss not being happy with them (5%). Consistent with this was the finding that most (63%) reported that they somewhat or very much liked their jobs. This question was not applicable to 24%, e.g., they did not have a job. Over one-third of the respondents (36%) reported that they left their jobs because they quit (16.4%), were laid off (13.1%), or were fired (6.5%). A relatively small percentage quit to take another job (11%).
9. The response to a question on the respondents' general view of life was generally very positive, with a majority (64%) indicating that they were satisfied or very satisfied, while 24% reported they felt OK or neutral. Only 15% stated that they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.

SUMMARY OF DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS

The following summary lists the major descriptive findings of the study. They are based upon the data presented in the previous sections on background information, school information, and post-school information as well as the statistical summaries from Appendix C of the second volume of this report.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. The sample of 234 respondents approximated the state's expected or known student population characteristics of age, sex, handicapping condition, and location of school district. However, there were major discrepancies between the sample and estimated population characteristics. The sample over-represented the physically handicapped and rural respondents and under-represented the emotionally/behaviorally disturbed. This is undoubtedly a consequence of our method or process of selecting graduates for interview which depended largely upon availability of graduates and their willingness to participate in the interview.
2. The female respondents in the sample were more likely to be married and have a family than the population at large. The most recent data on the status of never married, by age and sex, indicate that in 1977 there were 45.6% women and 64.5% men at the age of 22 in this category. Our sample for that age group indicates that 31% of the females and 69% of the males of our sample were never married. These differences for females may be even greater if we base our comparison on present population changes which are toward fewer women and men married by that age.
3. Nearly all respondents had never been in the service.
4. Most of the respondents were raised by both mother and father.

SCHOOL INFORMATION

5. Most of the respondents received a regular high school diploma, attended the 12th grade, attended a high school in the same school district, and majored in vocational rather

than college preparatory programs.

6. Although the majority of the respondents took classes in regular, vocational, and special education, a larger proportion took vocational and special education classes than regular education classes. Those in special education classes were more likely to be in a resource room than a self-contained classroom or a work study program.
7. More respondents valued their special education and vocational classes than their regular education classes. More respondents valued their special education teacher and their parents in helping them prepare for the future than any other person in the system, including the vocational education teacher, regular education teacher, Title I teacher, rehabilitation counselor, work study teacher, activities teacher, coach, principal/vice principal, friends, job supervisors or others.
8. The skill areas in which the respondents felt that they had received the best preparation vis-a-vis their needs now included: getting along with others, understanding own abilities, preparation to perform acceptable work and preparation to search, apply, and interview for jobs. The skill areas in which the respondents felt that their preparation did not surpass their current needs for training included: preparation to live independently, preparation to participate in social/community activities, knowledge about different jobs, and preparation to select the best job for self.

POST-SCHOOL INFORMATION

9. Few respondents reported that they had taken courses after high school. Those who had continued their education attended community or junior colleges and state colleges or universities with approximately equal frequency. A relatively smaller proportion attended a vocational or technical school.
10. Most of the respondents indicated that they were mobile within the community, either by driving themselves or by using the public transit system. A larger proportion reported they were driving than reported that they had auto insurance. This discrepancy may be due to coverage provided by a parent's insurance, given that a large proportion continued to live at home.
11. Apparently, the respondents have a relatively limited social life, with a large number receiving infrequent or no visits from others. This may not be as desperate as it seems given that nearly two-thirds reported that they lived with their parents or guardians. They may participate, at least to some degree, in the social life established by their parents. Nevertheless, this raises a question regarding how independent this group of respondents is in the conduct of their own social activities.
12. Although most respondents indicated significant activity in generating financial support for themselves, the results of these efforts are at best marginal. For example, approximately two-thirds of the sample reported that they were working. However, their earnings were reported to be at or below the minimum wage and they worked mostly part-time. Furthermore, financial assistance from other sources appears to be limited, with only a small proportion reporting that they regularly received money from their parents or other sources. This analysis is consistent with the lack of evidence of a significant amount of economic activity within the community. Those with money, slightly over half, had a savings account and only a small portion reported the use of a checking account. Most reported they were not making payments on any major items and when they did make a purchase they payed cash rather than using a credit card or charge account.
13. Most of the respondents held jobs since graduation and

were currently working. Nearly one-third reported that they found jobs themselves. Also important in the job search were teachers and friends, while parents were less important in the search. The majority of the sample reported having few problems at work, although a large percentage reported that they had quit, been laid off, or fired from previous jobs. Nearly two-thirds reported that they liked their jobs. In general, it appears that the respondents were experiencing substantial success in the job market, even though a large proportion was out of work when compared to the national average, and most of the work was at or below subsistence level and only part-time.

14. In spite of these limitations in social, financial, and vocational activity, nearly all respondents rated their life as being O.K., satisfying or very satisfying.

CROSS TABULATIONS

This section of the RESULTS provides a summary of the data analyses that identified significant relationships between variables in the survey. The cross tabulations employed in these analyses provided comparisons between demographic, school experience and postschool experience variables. A total of 72 comparisons were significant at or below the .05 level. They constituted the body of this section of the report, comprising the following major categories: high school, regular education, usefulness of regular education, usefulness of vocational education, training needs, sex, age, urban/rural, special education program, and handicapping condition correlates. The findings in each category and their supporting cross tabulations and statistics appear in Appendix D of the second volume of this report. The following is a listing of the findings for each of the ten categories.

High School Preparation Correlates

Respondents who found that their high school preparation:

1. to know about different jobs was very useful were more likely to be employed;
2. for job selection was of little use were more likely to dislike their jobs;
3. for social participation was very useful were more likely to have found their jobs independently; and
4. for social participation was somewhat or very useful were more likely to be happy with their lives.

Respondents who indicated that activity teachers (club leaders) were helpful in preparing them for the future were less likely to report raises in their jobs than those who did not regard the activity teacher to be helpful.

Respondents in college preparation programs were more likely to continue their education after graduation than those in vocational preparation sequences.

Regular Education Correlates

Respondents who took classes in regular education were:

1. less likely to receive vocational rehabilitation services;
2. less likely to receive money from parents and welfare;
3. less likely to have frequent contacts with relatives after graduation;
4. more likely to have frequent contacts with parents after graduation; and
5. more likely to earn money from jobs.

Usefulness of Regular Education Correlates

Respondents who indicated that their regular education coursework was:

1. useful or very useful were more likely to have car insurance; and
2. not at all or somewhat useful were more likely to use a car or motorcycle for transportation.

Usefulness of Vocational Education Correlates

Respondents who found vocational education classes to be useful or very useful were more likely to work overtime on their jobs and to have contacts with friends.

Training Needs Correlates

Respondents who expressed that they somewhat or very much needed:

1. additional training in performing acceptable work were more likely to be working part or overtime;
2. to know how to select the best job for them were more likely to depend upon their parents to find their jobs for them;
3. to be able to select the job best suited for them were more likely to be working overtime;
4. to know more about different jobs were more likely to be working part time or overtime; and
5. to know about different jobs were more likely to depend upon friends and parents to find jobs for them.

Sex Correlates

Male respondents were more likely:

1. to need help understanding their own abilities;
2. to have taken classes in regular education;
3. to be still working or to have quit to take another job;
4. to have received bonuses for working; and
5. to drive to work and other places than female respondents

Female respondents were more likely:

1. to be married;
2. to earn less than $4/hour;
3. to be out of work or working part or half time; and
4. to get to work and other places by carpool, bus, or walking than male respondents.

Age Correlates

Older respondents in this sample were more likely:

1. to be physically handicapped;
2. to consider their high school preparation for social participation to be very useful;
3. to consider their high school preparation to work well on a job to be very useful;
4. to indicate that their work study teachers were helpful;
5. to be out of work; and
6. to be financially dependent upon others for support than younger respondents.

Younger respondents were more likely:

1. to be classified as emotionally or behaviorally disturbed in high school;
2. to indicate that their parents, relatives and friends were helpful in preparing them for the future;
3. to be employed and earning an income;
4. to rely upon themselves to find jobs; and
5. to receive bonuses for working than older respondents.

Urban/Rural Correlates

Urban respondents were more likely:

1. to need more training on how to search for the job best suited for them;
2. to need more training on how to get along with others;
3. to have been in a resource or self-contained classroom;
4. to be still working;
5. to have quit or to have quit to find another job;
6. to have received bonuses for working;
7. to have held several jobs since high school; and
8. to indicate that their parents or relatives were helpful in preparing them for the future than rural respondents.

Rural respondents were more likely:

1. to indicate that courses in regular education were useful; and
2. to have been raised by both their mothers and fathers.

Special Education Program Correlates

Respondents from resource classrooms were more likely:

1. to be diagnosed as perceptual/communicative disordered; and
2. to have taken classes in regular education than respondents from self-contained or work study programs.

Respondents from resource and self-contained classrooms were more likely:

1. to receive a regular high school diploma;
2. to be still working;
3. to have quit to take other jobs or simply to have quit;
4. to find their preparation for job interviewing to be useful;
5. to need training in identifying appropriate jobs; and
6. to have held more jobs since high school than respondents from work study programs.

Respondents from resource and work study programs were more likely to:

1. have found jobs themselves; and
2. to indicate that activities teachers were not helpful in preparing them for the future than respondents from self-contained classrooms.

Respondents from self-contained and work study programs were more likely to:

1. to use vocational rehabilitation services;
2. to rely upon teachers to find jobs; and
3. to be fired from their jobs than respondents from resource classrooms.

Respondents from work study programs were more likely:

1. to visit or receive visits from relatives than those from self-contained or resource rooms; and
2. to take regular education classes than respondents from self-contained classes.

Respondents from self-contained classrooms were relatively more positive about help they received from their activities teachers than respondents from resource or work-study programs.

Handicapping Condition Correlates

P/C respondents were more likely:

1. to receive a regular high school diploma;
2. to find special education very useful;
3. to indicate that their parents were helpful in preparing them for the future;
4. to receive bonuses on their jobs;
5. to be earning more than $3/hour than respondents with other handicaps;
6. to be from a resource room;
7. to depend upon their families to find them jobs than EBD or mentally retarded respondents;
8. to indicate a need for training in getting along with others;
9. to be in a vocational program than EBD or physically handicapped respondents; and
10. to find jobs independently (by self) than mentally retarded respondents.

Physically handicapped respondents were more likely:

1. to be from a resource room;
2. to be dependent upon their friends to find them jobs than EBD or mentally retarded respondents;
3. to take regular education classes than mentally retarded respondents; and
4. to find jobs independently than P/C or mentally retarded respondents.

Physically handicapped respondents were less likely:

1. to indicate that work study teachers helped prepare them for the future than respondents with other handicaps; and
2. to indicate that their parents were helpful in preparing them for the future than EBD or mentally retarded respondents.

Mentally retarded respondents were more likely:

1. to be from self-contained classes or work study programs than from resource classrooms;
2. to indicate a need for training in getting along with others;
3. to have been in a vocational program than EBD or physically handicapped respondents; and
4. to indicate that work study teachers were helpful in preparing them for the future than respondents with other handicaps.

EBD respondents were more likely:

1. to have taken classes in regular education than mentally retarded or physically handicapped respondents;
2. to be from a work study program rather than a resource or self-contained classroom;
3. to find jobs independently than P/C or mentally retarded respondents; and
4. to be working than respondents with other handicaps.

EBD respondents were less likely to find special education very useful than respondents with other handicaps.

SUMMARY OF CROSS TABULATIONS

A number of consistent patterns emerged from the findings generated by the cross tabulations presented in Appendix D of the second volume of this report and described in the preceding section. These included relationships between the respondents' high school preparation, sex, age, place of residence, special education experiences, handicapping conditions and their post high school adjustments. In general, these findings provided elaborations of the descriptive findings presented in a previous section.

HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCES

On the postive side, respondents who were happy with their high school preparation were better adjusted on their jobs after graduation. Also, respondents who took classes in regular education were more financially independent, socially integrated with their immediate families, and successful at earning a living. Respondents who found vocational education to be useful were more likely to work overtime at their jobs.

Respondents also indicated areas in which they felt a need for additional training. These needs related to occupational outcomes as well. For example, respondents who expressed needs for additional training in performing acceptable work, knowing about different jobs, and selecting the job best suited for them were less independent in finding their own jobs and worked less regularly than respondents who did not express these needs.

SEX

In general, male respondents reported greater occupational successes than female respondents who earned less, were more likely to be out of work, were less independently mobile in the community, and were more likely to be married.

AGE

Younger respondents appeared to have been better prepared for post high school adjustments than older respondents who, by contrast, were more positive about their high school experiences.

RESIDENCE

Urban respondents exhibited more frequent occupational successes while indicating a greater need for training in searching for jobs and getting along with others than rural respondents.

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Respondents from resource classrooms exhibited greater occupational successes than respondents from self-contained classrooms or work study programs.

HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

P/C and physically handicapped respondents were more likely to have been in resource classrooms in high school, while EBD respondents were more likely to have been in work study programs, and MR respondents were more likely to have been in self-contained or work study programs. P/C respondents indicated more frequent postive adjustments than EBD respondents who, in turn, exhibited relatively more successful post high school

adjustments than physically handicapped respondents who reported more success than mentally retarded respondents.

P/C and EBD respondents were more likely to take classes in regular education than physically handicapped respondents who were more likely to have taken regular education classes than MR respondents. Reactions to special education programs also differed by handicapping conditions, with P/C respondents being the most positive and EBD respondents being the least positive about the usefulness of their experiences.

REGRESSION ANALYSES

Analyses of the variables that predicted post high school adjustments indicated the following relationships.

1. Respondents' perceptions of help received from work study teachers and the respondents' ages were the best predictors of hours worked on the job.
2. Respondents' perceptions of how well their high school prepared them to work, their needs for social skill training, and their perception of help received from parents and relatives were the best predictors of how well they liked their jobs.
3. Respondents' perceptions of how helpful activity teachers were in preparing them for the future and the respondents' sex were the best predictors of earnings on the job.
4. Respondents' perception of how well their high school prepared them to search for other jobs, their official graduation certificate (diploma or certificate of completion) and their sex were the best predictors of the number of jobs held since high school.
5. Respondents' perception of the usefulness of the special education program was the best predictor of how they found their jobs.
6. Respondents' participation in one of the three special education programs (resource room, self contained room, work study program) was the best predictor of their satisfaction with life.
7. Respondents' sex, family rearing (who raised him/her), and perception of the usefulness of regular education were the best predictors of how often friends visited.
8. Respondents' perception of how helpful their parents, relatives and activity teachers were in preparing them for the future were the best predictors of how often parents visited.
9. Respondents' perception of how helpful activity teachers were in helping them prepare for the future and the respondents' place of residence (urban/rural) were the best predictors of how often relatives visited.
10. Respondents' perception of how helpful work study teachers and parents were in preparing them for the future were the best predictors of sources for receiving money.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FROM REGRESSION ANALYSES

The most frequent predictors of post high school adjustments were in three categories: high school experiences, sex of respondents, and support received from parents and relatives. These findings suggest that the special education and regular education programs have a significant bearing on respondents' post high school adjustments; that the sex of the respondents is also a determinant in that adjustment; and that parents and relatives play a significant role in the entire process.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The first conclusion concerns the degree to which the researchers can generalize from the sample to the general population of handicap-

ped students who graduated in 1978 and 1979. There appear to be some similarities between the sample of survey respondents and estimated population characteristics. One should be careful about concluding, however, that the findings of this study are a reasonable estimation of the status of special education 1978-79 graduates in general. A preferred method of arriving at such a conclusion would have been to conduct a sampling procedure that was free of the biases of interviewing respondents who were available and willing to interview. This, of course, is one of the chief obstacles to conducting followup surveys in general. Consequently, one might remember the risks involved in generalizing findings from this sample to the population in 1978-79 or another population graduating in earlier or later years.

2. A second conclusion is that most of the graduates seem to have come from intact homes as nearly three-fourths indicated that they were raised by both their fathers and mothers. This family structure appears strong and influential even after school, as most of the respondents continued to live at home. This stable family unit may be one of the most significant factors in the respondents' overall outlook and adjustment. It is not surprising then, that few join the armed services, which is an alternative institutional living and employment arrangement to the family.

3. The third conclusion is that female graduates are more likely to be married than male graduates. Furthermore, this probability seems to be higher than for non-handicapped females of the same age. This raises some interesting questions. Do female graduates seek marriage as a substitute for their own careers at a time when many non-handicapped women are making the opposite choice? Is this decision a consequence of not being adequately prepared at the secondary level as suggested by Dinger (1976)?

4. General school information on the graduate status of the respondents does little to indicate that the students were in special programs. Nearly all attended the 12th grade and received a high school diploma. When describing specific programs of study or courses taken, the purpose of the instruction becomes more evident as nearly all graduates had taken courses in special education, with a somewhat lesser proportion taking courses in vocational education. Therefore, specific course work rather than the last grade attended or graduation certificate appears to be a better indicator of the graduates' activities at school.

5. A fifth conclusion is that, in the opinion of the graduates of this sample, special education coursework was more useful than vocational education coursework which, in turn, was more useful than regular education coursework. This finding corresponds to their view also that parents and special education teachers were more helpful than any other person in preparing them for the future. including vocational and regular education teachers. This suggests that the special education program and special education teachers played significant roles in preparing graduates for the future.

6. A sixth conclusion is that the high school program may need to add to its career education curriculum in such areas as independent living, community participation and knowledge about different jobs. These findings are congruent with other data indicating that most respondents live at home, have limited social lives, and must rely upon themselves to find jobs.

7. The seventh conclusion is that even though the respondents are mobile and employable (as evidenced by the frequency of job attainment), they remain at marginal levels in the community's social, economic and employment activities. Most respondents live at home, have infrequent contacts with friends, engage in limited economic transaction with the community, and earn a minimum wage at part-time work. The unemployment rate for the sample was three times that of the national rate if part-time work is counted in the employment rate. Only counting full-time work in the rate, unemployment was nearly seven

times the national average.

8. The respondents' view of their lives is quite positive. Considering the unemployment rate within the group, together with the living and social conditions, this is somewhat surprising. The best explanation may be that the family (e.g., mother and father) plays a significant role in mediating many of these uncommon hardships.

9. There were several significant relations between respondents' answers to questions about their high school education and their post high school adjustments. In general, positive responses correlated positively with successful adjustments and expressions of training needs correlated positively with difficulties at work. This supports earlier descriptive findings specifying a need for improvements in the high school's efforts to prepare students for work.

10. A final conclusion is that respondents' sex, age, place of residence, type of special education program in high school, and handicapping conditions bore significant relationships with post high school adjustments. In fact, the characteristics that most consistently related to a positive post high school adjustment were: male, younger age, urban residence, special education experience in a resource room, and a perceptual/communicative disorder for the handicapping condition. The composite for a relatively successful special education graduate would be: a young P/C male graduate of an urban high school who was enrolled in a resource classroom and participated in regular education classes. By contrast, a composite description of a relatively less successful graduate would be: an older mentally retarded female graduate from a rural high school who participated almost exclusively in a work-study program or a self-contained classroom.

IMPLICATIONS

In general, the findings of this study suggest that participants from special education programs in the State of Colorado have made positive adjustments in their communities after graduation from high school. Nearly 70% were working at least part-time and contributing significantly to their own support. There was little evidence of financial dependence upon such social programs as welfare for sustenance.

Although this finding generally supports the value of special education efforts during the school years, instructional opportunities for this population need to continue to improve. Many graduates' earnings were at marginal levels. This condition is similar to that reported in previous followup studies. The employment rate of 69% for the present study (including part-time work) is comparable to earlier work that reported rates between 50 and 90%. If one excludes part-time work in these figures, the present rate drops significantly and is higher than the estimation made by Dinger (1976) that unemployment for special education students is five times that of the normal population.

One explanation for the apparent discrepancy between actual earnings and the respondents' report of minimal dependence upon welfare for support is the family. Previous studies have also indicated that graduates typically live at home and earn marginal incomes. The condition has not changed appreciably in recent years, as this sample also fits a pattern of family dependence and financial instability. When one views these patterns in light of respondents' efforts to find jobs, an interesting contradiction emerges. The persons most frequently cited as being helpful in finding the graduates jobs *did not include their parents.* Self-initiatives and help from teachers and friends played more significant roles. The obvious implication for preparing special education

students for work is to enlist the support and cooperation of parents. It is evident that student skills in job search, selection and performance may be only one ingredient in a successful long-term vocational adjustment. Parental cooperation and contribution to this process may be equally important. In this regard, school programs may need to consider how best to involve parents and other family members in assisting students to search, select and secure work in the community.

A second set of findings that has implications for future programming efforts relates to how the respondents perceived their educational experiences. In this regard, special education programs were viewed as most valuable, vocational programs next, and regular education as least valuable. Given this general view of their experiences, respondents were able to further specify areas in which they needed more training. These included specific vocational skills as well as social and independent living skills. This suggests a refocusing of the special education curriculum, at least at the junior and senior high levels, on the development of critical community survival skills.

A final pattern of results that is important to consider relates to the differential effects of such variables as the respondents' sex, age, place of residence, special education program, and handicapping condition. Ideally, special education programs would respond to each student's individual needs in order to maximize his or her potential. This is a difficult goal but one that is worth setting as a marker against which to evaluate present efforts. The results of this study suggest that younger male respondents who were diagnosed as P/C in high school and who participated in a resource and regular classes in an urban high school were the most likely to experience success after graduation. This raises questions about how to serve students who do not fit this composite. An examination of programming activities in each of these areas may prove beneficial.

In general, this study, like others of its kind, has raised as many questions as it has answered. This is to be expected if one views followup studies as part of an ongoing process of evaluation designed to improve service delivery. Rather than seeking or expecting a "one-shot" affirmation or repudiation of existing educational practices, one must examine in some detail the activities that are having a positive impact and identify those that need to change in order to further enhance long-term outcomes. This is the proper context for interpreting the findings of the present study.

REFERENCES

Baller, W.R. A study of the present social status of a group of adults who when they were in elementary schools were classified as mentally deficient. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1936, 18, 165-244.

Bobroff, A. Economic adjustment of 121 adults, formerly students in classes for mental retardates. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1955, 60, 525-535.

Boyce, D.A., and Elzey, F.F. A study of the vocational adequacy of former special education students following high school graduation. Sacramento, California: California State Department of Education, 1978.

Carriker, W.R. A comparison of post school adjustment of regular and special class retarded individuals served in Lincoln and Omaha, Nebraska, public schools. Contract No. SAE-6445, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1957.

Cassidy, V.M., and Phelps, H.R. Postschool adjustment of slow learning children. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Special and Adult Education, The Ohio State University, 1955.

Collister, L. A comparison of the long range benefits of graduation from special v. mainstream school for mildly mentally handicapped students. Seattle, Wash.: Seattle Public Schools, Washington, Department of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, 1975.

Coonley, P. "A fifteen year follow up study of the North Kansas City Public Schools work study graduates 1966-1980." Paper presented at the annual international convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (58th, Philadelphia, PA, April, 1980, Session TH-78).

Dearborn Public Schools, Michigan. A follow-up and comparison of graduates from two types of high school programs for the mentally handicapped: Final Report. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1970.

Dinger, J.D. "Post-school adjustment of former special education pupils with implications for curriculum revision." Unpubiished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, The Pennysylvania State University, 1958.

Dinger, J.D. Former educable retarded pupils. Exceptional Children, 1961, 27, 353-360.

Dinger, J.C. A follow up study of the post school employment success of graduetes from four high school special education programs in the midwestern intermediate Unit IV in Pennsylvania for the school years 1969-1970. A Final Report. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania State Department of Education, 1973.

Fairbanks, R. The subnormal child seventeen years after. Mental Hygiene, 1933, 17, 177-208.

Gozali, J. Perceptions of the EMR special class by former students. Mental Retardation, 1972, 10, 34-35.

Keim, R.G. A proposed strategy of diagnosis of vocational potential of a tenth grade urban educable mentally retarded work-study population: An alternative to existing organizational practice. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Case Western Reserve University, 1979.

Kennedy, R.J.R. The social adjustment of morons in a Connecticut city. Wilport, Conn: Commissions to Study Resources in Connecticut: 1948.

Kennedy, R.J.R. A Connecticut community revisited: A study of the social adjustment of a group of mentally deficient adults in 1948 and 1960. Final report on project, No. 655, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, 1962.

Kernan, C.B. A follow-up study of students placed in educable mentally retarded classes who graduated from programs in the Northwest Bergen Council for Special Education. New Brunswick, N.J.:Rutgers University, 1979.

Peterson, L. "The mentally retarded as citizens." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1959.

Peterson, L., and Smith, L. The post-school adjustment of educable mentally retarded adults with that of adults of normal intelligence. Exceptional Children, 1960, 26, 404-408.

Powers, G., and Lewis, J. 1970-1975 follow-up of hearing impaired graduates of Pennsylvania. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania State Department of Education, 1976.

Saenger, G. The adjustment of severely retarded adults in the community. Albany, N.Y.: Interdepartmental Health Resources Board, 1957.

Titus, R.W., and Travis, J.T. Follow-up of EMR program graduates. Mental Retardation, 1975, 11, 24-26.

2 of 2

The Colorado Statewide Followup Survey of Special Education Students

Appendices

Dr. Dennis E. Mithaug
School of Education
University of Colorado - Colorado Springs

Dr. Chiyo N. Horiuchi
Colorado Department of Education

A study commissioned by:
Colorado Department of Education
Calvin M. Frazier, Commissioner
Edwin E. Steinbrecher, Deputy Commissioner
Peter S. Fanning, Executive Director

September, 1983

EC 171140

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW INTRODUCTION

Hello:

My name is _____ . I am from the Followup Survey Project sponsored by the Colorado Department of Education and the University of Colorado.

The purpose of the project is to interview students who graduated in 1978 and 1979 and who received special education services in high school. We are asking them what they think of their high school experience and what they are doing right now. This information which you provide will be very important. It will help the Department of Education improve the high school experiences of future students.

I really appreciate your agreeing to help me on this project.

All of the information you give me during the interview will be kept strictly confidential. This means that only you and I will know how you answered the questions. This is important for you to understand because it will allow you to say exactly what you think. Of course, you may refuse to answer questions if you prefer.

Again, I want to thank you for agreeing to meet and talk with me.

INTERVIEW PERMISSION FORM

I _____ GIVE MY PERMISSION TO PARTICIPATE

IN THIS FOLLOWUP SURVEY PERSONAL INTERVIEW CONDUCTED ON _____ (DATE)

WITH _____ (INTERVIEWER).

SIGNED_____ DATE_____

SCHOOL RECORDS PERMISSION FORM

I _____ GIVE MY PERMISSION FOR THE FOLLOWUP SURVEY STAFF TO GATHER INFORMATION FROM MY SCHOOL TO COMPLETE THE HIGH SCHOOL BACKGROUND INFORMATION SHEET.

SIGNED_____ DATE_____

The Colorado Statewide Followup Survey Questionnaire[1]

We wish to express our appreciation to Dr. Gary Moore for assisting in the development of the questionnaire.

High School Background Information

1. Interviewer Name:_____
2. Subject Name:_____
3. Subject ID Number:_____
4. High School Graduation Date:_____
5. School District Name and Number:_____
6. High School Name:_____
7. Administrative Unit Name:_____
8. Did Subject receive: (a) high school diploma
   (b) certification of completion
9. If subject did not receive either of the above, circle highest grade completed:

   (c) 7 8 9 10 11 12
10. What was the subject's primary handicap?

    _____ 1. TMR
    _____ 2. EMR
    _____ 3. EB
    _____ 4. P/C
    _____ 5. hearing
    _____ 6. vision
    _____ 7. physical
    _____ 8. speech/language
    _____ 9. If multiply handicapped, please specify primary and secondary handicaps

    _____
11. Did the subject go through all high school grades in this school district?

    _____ 1. Yes, completed at least grades 10-12.
    _____ 2. No, only completed grade(s) 9 10 11 12 (circle all that apply in this district.) Remaining high school experience was:

        _____ a. in the state of Colorado
        _____ b. outside the state of Colorado
        _____ c. not known or available
12. What was the subject's major course of study?

    _____ 1. College Prep
    _____ 2. Vocational

THE INTERVIEW

1. Interviewer Name:_____

2. Subject Name:_____

3. Subject ID Number:_____

4. Date of Interview:_____
   Yr. Mo. Day

6. Chronological Age:_____

7. Sex: Male_____ Female:_____

8. Marital Status: a. married
   b. single
   c. divorced
   d. widowed

9. Number of Children:_____

10. Have you ever served in the military?
    a. yes
    b. no

11. If subject has not served in the military go to #12. If subject as served ask:

    A. What military service?
    (1) Army
    (2) Air Force
    (3) Navy
    (4) Coast Guard
    (5) Marines
    (6) Other (please specify_____)

    B. Were you drafted?
    a. Yes
    b. No

    C. What was your length of service?
    (1) 2 years
    (2) 3 years
    (3) 4 years
    (4) 5 years
    (5) 6 years
    (6) other (please specify_____)

D. What was your rank? _____

E. What was your type of discharge?

(1) honorable
(2) dishonorable
(3) medical
(4) section 8
(5) other (please specify _____)

12. At the time of completing high school, who was the main person responsible for raising you?

(1) mother
(2) father
(3) mother and father
(4) legal guardian(s) (please specify relationship_____)

13. At the time of completing high school, what was (were) the occupation(s) of your legal guardian (parents)?

(1) mother's occupation_____

(2) father's occupation_____

(3) legal guardian's occupation_____

14. When in high school, did you ever take courses in regular education (such as English, literature, writing, math, foreign languages, science, history, etc)?

(1) Yes
(2) No, I was not required to take these courses
(3) No, I chose not to take them.
(4) No, these courses were not offered in my school.

14b If no go to #15, if yes ask: How useful have those courses been to you?

(1) Not at all useful
(2) Somewhat useful
(3) Very useful

14c If not at all useful ask: Why haven't these courses been useful to you?_____

_____

If somewhat or very useful ask: How have these courses been useful to you_____

_____

15. When in high school, did you ever take classes in special education (such as in a resource room, work experience and study program, or in a self-contained class)?

(1) Yes
(2) No, I was not required to take these classes
(3) No, I chose not to take them
(4) No, these classes were not offered in my school

15b If no go to #16, if yes ask: How useful have these courses been to you?

(1)Not at all useful
(2)Somewhat useful
(3)Very useful

15c If not at all useful ask: Why haven't these courses been useful to you?_____

_____

If somewhat or very useful ask: How have these courses been useful to you?_____

_____

16. When in high school, did you ever take classes in Vocational Education (such as home economics, automechanics, food service, drafting, metal shop, carpentry, business, typing, shorthand, etc.):

(1)Yes
(2)No, I was not required to take these courses
(3)No, I chose not to take them
(4)No, these courses were not offered in my school

16b If no go to #17, if yes ask: How useful have these courses been to you?

(1)Not at all useful
(2)Somewhat useful
(3)Very useful

16c If not at all useful ask: Why haven't these courses been useful to you?_____

_____

If somewhat or very useful ask: How have these courses been useful to you?_____

_____

17. a. How useful was your high school program in preparing you to (read items a thru h): (enter number of following response in the first column: 3-Very Useful, 2-Somewhat useful, 1-Not at all Useful)
b. And do you need those skills now? (3-Very much need, 2-Somewhat need, 1-Not at all need)

How Useful		Do you need it now?
_____	a. Live independently in the community (e.g., manage your money, take care of a home, take care of personal needs, plan and prepare meals, select and buy own clothing etc.)	_____
_____	b. Participate in social or community activities (using recreational facilities, going to church or community events)	_____
_____	c. Get along with others (e.g., make new friends, get along in public places, have good times without getting into trouble)	_____
_____	d. Understand your abilities, talents and interests (know what you can do for fun and for work)	_____
_____	e. Know about different jobs	_____
_____	f. Select the best job for you	_____

How Useful		Do you need it now
_____	g. Search, apply, and interview for a job	_____
_____	h. Perform acceptable (good) work on the job	_____

18. Who was most helpful or useful to you in planning or assigning in your future?

Name_____

What was his/her position in the school/home etc.? _____

When did he/she help you?_____

How did he/she help you?_____

19. Were any of the following persons helpful or useful to you in planning or assisting in your future? (Check in the first column if yes they were helpful. If not helpful, go to the next item. If yes, also enter name of the person, when the person was helpful (grade levels), and how the person was helpful).

YES	Person	Name	When
____	a. Regular classroom teacher (e.g., English, math, science) How:_____	_____	_____
____	b. Special Education Teacher (resource teacher; P and C teacher) How:_____	_____	_____
____	c. Title I Teacher (remedial reading or math teacher) How:_____	_____	_____
____	d. Vocational Education Teacher (e.g., shop teacher, home economics, business, typing) How:_____	_____	_____
____	e. Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor (e.g., job assistance person) How:_____	_____	_____
____	f. Work-study teacher (e.g., Pre-Voc. teacher, WES Coordinator) How:_____	_____	_____

YES	Person	Name	When
____	g. Activity Club Sponsor (e.g., person who leads fun or interest clubs, extra-curricular activities, pep club, student-council, drama club, drill teams)		
	How:_____	_____	_____
____	h. Coach/Phys. Ed. Teacher	_____	_____
	How:_____		
____	i. Principal, Vice or Assistant Principal	_____	_____
	How:_____		
____	j. Other School Staff (e.g., secretary, nurse, speech therapist, occupational therapist, psychologist, etc.) Specify	_____	_____
	How:_____		
____	k. Parents (legal guardians or relatives)	_____	_____
	Relation:_____		
	How: _____		
____	l. Friends (e.g., boy or girlfriends, friends of the famiiy)	_____	_____
	How:_____		
____	m. Job supervisor (foreman, boss)	_____	_____
	How:_____		
	For what job:_____	_____	_____
____	n. Others (please specify occupation)		
	_____		
	How:_____	_____	_____

20a. What was the single best experience you had in high school?

20b. What was the single worst experience you had in high school?

20c. Since high school, have you taken courses from a (check all that apply)

_____ a. Community or junior college
_____ b. State college or university
_____ c. Vocational or technical school
_____ d. Free University
_____ e. Other (please specify)_____

21. Why did you take courses? (answer all that apply)

_____ a. I was seeking a degree (please specify degree)_____
_____ b. It was a job-related course (please specify job)_____
_____ c. It was interesting to me.
_____ d. Other (please specify)_____

22. What is your current job or occupation?

_____ a. Currently not employed or not looking
_____ b. Currently unemployed and looking
_____ c. Yes, currently employed as: (please specify occupation)_____
_____ d. Homemaker (if yes, answer d(1)-d(4) and skip 23-28)

(1) How long have you been a homemaker?_____
(2) Do you like it? Yes No
(3) What activities do you perform as a homemaker?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

(4) Does anyone help you with those activities? Yes No
If yes, who?_____

23. How did you find the job?

_____ a. I found it. (ask how?_____)
_____ b. Parents (legal guardians) found it. (ask how?_____)
_____ c. Relatives found it. (ask how?_____)
_____ d. Friends found it. (ask how?_____)
_____ e. Teacher found it. (ask how?_____)
(ask who?_____)

24. In your current job, do you work:

_____ a. not currently working
_____ b. Part-time (less than 15 hours per week)
_____ c. Half-time (15 to 25 hours per week)
_____ d. Full-time (26 to 40 hours per week)
_____ e. Over-time (greater than 40 hours per week)

25. How much do you earn? (Specify amount per week, month or year_____)

26. Have you had a pay raise in this job?

_____ a. No, job doesn't have any built into it.
_____ b. No, just started working, but I plan on having one in (specify months)
_____ months.

_____ c. No, but others in similar positions have received one, but I haven't (then ask: Why do you think you haven't received one?_____

_____

d. Yes, a pay raise is built into the job every (specify months) _____ months.

e. Yes, pay raises are based on how well I work. I received (specify amount of raise per unit of time)_____

f. Other (Please specify)_____

27. At work have you ever had problems with: (Check if yes, ask for an example)

_____ a. doing good work (e.g.,_____)

_____ b. working the entire day (e.g.,_____)

_____ c. your boss being happy with your work (e.g.,_____)

_____ d. people not talking to you (e.g.,_____)

_____ e. people picking on you (e.g.,_____)

_____ f. your boss not telling you when you've done a good job (e.g.,_____

_____

_____ g. other (specify please_____)

28. How much do you like your job?

_____ a. not at all

_____ b. like it somewhat

_____ c. like it very much

28a. Is your current job the same one you've had since you left high school?

_____ a. Yes

_____ b. No

28b. If yes, go to #29, if no ask: How many other jobs have you had since high school and including those in high school?

_____ a. one

_____ b. two

_____ c. three

_____ d. four

_____ e. other (specify)_____

28c. What job did you have before this one?_____

What were your duties?_____

How long did you have it?_____

How much did you like it?_____

_____ a. Not at all

_____ b. Like it somewhat

_____ c. Like it very much

Did you supervise anyone?_____ If so, how many?_____

28d. How did you find the job?

_____ a. I found it (ask how?_____)

_____ b. Parents (legal guardians) found it (ask how?_____)

_____ c. Relatives found it (Ask how?_____)

_____ d. Friends found it (ask how?_____)

_____ e. Teacher found it. (ask how?_____)

(ask who?_____)

28e. In that job, did you work:

_____ a. not currently working
_____ b. Part-time (less than 15 hours a week)
_____ c. Half-time (15-25 hours per week)
_____ d. Full-time (26 to 40 hours per week)
_____ e. Over-time (greater than 40 hours per week)

28f. How much did you earn when you started? ($/hr)_____

How much did you earn when you finished (quit) this job?_____
(If same as when started to to 28 g)

How many pay raises did you receive?_____

28g. At that job did you ever have problems with:

_____ a. doing good enough work (e.g.,_____)
_____ b. working the entire day (e.g.,_____)
_____ c. your boss being happy with your work (e.g.,_____)
_____ d. people not talking to you (e.g.,_____)
_____ e. people picking on you (e.g.,_____)
_____ f. your boss not telling you when you've done a good job (e.g.,_____

_____

28h. Why did you leave your job?

_____ a. quit to take a better job
_____ b. quit
_____ c. laid off
_____ d. fired

IF SUBJECT HAS HAD MORE JOBS REPEAT ITEMS 28c-28H IN THE ADDENDUM

28i. Of all the jobs you've worked, which one did you like the most?_____

Why? _____

28j. Of all the jobs you've worked, which one did you like the least?_____

Why? _____

29. What kind of job would you like best?_____

30. Where are you living now? (Then ask) How long have you lived there?

Where living		How Long
_____	a. I own my own home	_____
_____	b. I live in an apartment by myself	_____
_____	c. I live in an apartment with some friends	_____
_____	d. I live with my parents (or legal guardians)	_____
_____	e. I live with relatives (specify who_____)	_____
_____	f. I live in a group home	_____
_____	g. Other (specify_____)	_____

31. Have you had the same living arrangement since high school?

_____ a. Yes
_____ b. No. (Specify type of arrangement and length of time back to high school_____

_____

32. How do you usually get to work?

_____ a. I drive a car or motorcycle
_____ b. I carpool with others
_____ c. Bus
_____ d. Bicycle
_____ e. Walk
_____ f. Taxi
_____ g. Other (please specify_____)

33. How do you usually get to places (e.g., shopping, church, entertainment etc.) in the community?

_____ a. I drive a car or motorcycle
_____ b. I carpool with others
_____ c. Bus
_____ d. Bicycle
_____ e. Walk
_____ f. Taxi
_____ g. Other (please specify_____)

34. If you drive or operate a motor vehicle, do you have insurance?

_____ a. No, I do not drive
_____ b. No, I drive, but do not have insurance
_____ c. Yes.

35. How often do you visit or receive visits each week from: (1: less than 1 per week; 2: 2 to 4 per per week; 3: 5 or more visits per week)

_____ a. Parents (guardians)
_____ b. Relatives
_____ c. Friends
_____ d. Others

36. Have you ever used Vocational Rehabilitation Services or counselors to help you for job assistance_____, vocational training_____, money, or support during training_____)

_____ a. Yes.
_____ b. No.
_____ c. Don't know.

If no, go to 37, if yes ask:

_____ a. For what purpose?_____
_____ b. How long or often?_____

37. Do you regularly receive additional money from: (Check if yes)

_____ a. Parents
_____ b. Welfare
_____ c. Vocational Rehabilitation
_____ d. Social Security
_____ e. Other (Specify_____)

38. Do you currently have money in: (check if yes)

_____ a. Savings account
_____ b. Checking account
_____ c. Other (Specify_____)

39. Are you currently making payments on: (Check if yes)

_____ a. Car
_____ b. Home
_____ c. Appliances or furniture
_____ d. Other (Specify_____)

40. How do you usually purchase items?

_____ a. Barter/trade
_____ b. Pay cash/write check
_____ c. Credit cards
_____ d. Charge accounts

41. How do you feel about your life so far?

_____ a. Very disssatisfied/very unhappy
_____ b. Dissatisfied/unhappy
_____ c. OK, neutral
_____ d. Satisfied/happy
_____ e. Very satisfied/very happy

42. If you wanted to change anything about your life, what would it be?

QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEW BASED UPON YOUR PERCEPTION OF INTERVIEW

1. How happy is the subject? Very happy 1 2 3 4 5 Very Unhappy

2. How successfully has the subject adapted to community life?
Very successfully 1 2 3 4 5 Very Unsuccessfully

3. Please comment on anything you may think is relevant to the interview and purposes of the study.

ADDENDUM

28c. What job did you have before this one?_____

What were your duties?_____

How long did you have it?_____

How much did you like it?_____

_____ (1) Not at all

_____ (2) Like it somewhat

_____ (3) Like it very much

Did you supervise anyone?_____ If so, how many?_____

28d. How did you find the job?

_____ (1) I found it (ask how?_____)

_____ (2) Parents (legal guardians) found it (ask how?_____

_____)

_____ (3) Relatives found it (ask how?_____)

_____ (4) Friends found it (ask how?_____)

_____ (5) Teacher found it (ask how?_____)

(ask who?_____)

28e. In that job, did you work:

_____ (1) Part-time (less than 15 hours a week)

_____ (2) Half-time (15-25 hours per week)

_____ (3) Full-time (26-40 hours per week)

_____ (4) Over-time (greater than 40 hours per week)

28f. How much did you earn when you started? ($/hr)_____

How much did you earn when you finished (quit) this job?_____

How many pay raises did you receive?_____

28g. At that job did you ever have problems with:

_____ (1) doing good enough work (e.g.,_____)

_____ (2) working the entire day (e.g.,_____)

_____ (3) your boss being happy with your work (e.g.,_____)

_____ (4) people not talking to you (e.g.,_____)

_____ (5) people picking on you (e.g.,_____)

_____ (6) your boss not telling you when you've done a good job (e.g.,_____

_____)

_____ (7) other (e.g.,_____)

28h. Why did you leave your job?

_____ (1) quit to take a better job

_____ (2) quit

_____ (3) laid off

_____ (4) fired

WHEN COMPLETED FOR ALL JOBS RETURN TO 28i, PAGE 9

APPENDIX B

Student Name_____ Administrative Unit_____

PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER IN EACH BOX

Principal Handicapping Condition in the last year of school

A - Handicapping Condition code

1. Trainable Mentally Retarded
2. Educable Mentally Retarded
3. Emotional/Behavioral
4. Perceptual/Communicative
5. Hearing
6. Visual
7. Physical
8. Speech
9. Deaf/Blind
10. Multiple

Principal Delivery Code in the last year of school

B. Delivery Code

1. Regular Ed. (w/consultant)
2. Itinerant
3. Resource
4. Self-Contained
5. Work Study
6. Home Hospital

Type of official school papers received at completion of special education program

C. Official School Paper

1. Regular Diploma
2. Special Diploma
3. Certificate of Attendance
4. Certificate of Completion
5. Other

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

	Frequency	Percent	Chi Square	Sign. Level
A. Sex of Respondents				
1. Male	149	65		
2. Female	82	35		
			19.4	.000
B. Age of Respondents				
1. 19	1	0		
2. 20	2	1		
3. 21	41	19		
4. 22	80	53		
5. 23	77	33		
6. 24	17	7		
7. 25	9	4		
8. 26	1	0		
9. 27	1	0		
10. 29	4	2	385.2	.000
C. Handicap of Respondents				
1. Trainable Mentally Retarded	11	6		
2. Educable Mentally Retarded	57	31		
3. Emotional or Behavioral	22	12		
4. Perceptual or Communicative	60	32		
5. Hearing Impaired	4	2		
6. Visually Impaired	5	3		
7. Physically Handicapped	6	3		
8. Speech Disorder	4	2		
9. Deaf or Blind	3	2	29.8	.000
D. Location of Respondent's High School by Administrative Unit				
1. Adams 12	13	6		
2. Adams 27J	1	0		
3. Adams-Arapahoe 28J	13	6		
4. Arapahoe 2	1	0		
5. AvBoces	3	1		
6. Bocs-Hayden	1	0		
7. Bocs-Steamboat	1	0		
8. El Paso - 11	23	10		
9. East Central BOCS	10	4		
10. Jefferson R-1	30	13		
11. Larimer R3	4	2		
12. Littleton 6	16	7		
13. Sheridan Dist 2	5	2		
14. South Central BOCS	6	3		
15. South Eastern BOCS	4	2		
16. Weld	11	5		
17. Adams 50	7	3		
18. Denver 1	35	15		

19.	Montrose RE-1J	6	3		
20.	Moffat 1	2	1		
21.	Delores RE-1	1	0		
22.	Huge RE-1	1	0		
23.	Pueblo 60	15	7		
24.	San Juan BOCS	4	2		
25.	Dist. 12 — Cheyenne Mtn.	2	1		
26.	Boulder RE-2J	14	6	296.7	.000
E.	Urban/Rural Representation				
1.	Urban	133	57		
2.	Rural	99	43	5.0	.026
F.	Marital Status				
1.	Married	45	20		
2.	Single	179	78		
3.	Divorced	5	2	217.6	.000
G.	Number of Children (of those married)				
1.	None	22	39		
2.	One	19	34		
3.	Two	13	25		
4.	Three	1	2	26.1	.000
H.	Military Status (ever in service)				
1.	Yes	12	5		
2.	No	217	95	182.5	.000
I.	Family Background - Who Raised Respondent?				
1.	Mother	37	16		
2.	Father	16	7		
3.	Mother and Father	172	74		
4.	Legal Guardians	8	3	296.7	.000
II.	SCHOOL INFORMATION				
A.	Type of Certificate Received from High School				
1.	Regular Diploma	204	89		
2.	Special Diploma	11	5		
3.	Certificate of Attendance	5	2		
4.	Certificate of Completion	9	4		
5.	Other	1	0	679.7	.000
B.	Highest Grade Completed/Attended				
1.	11th Grade	4	2		
2.	12th Grade	163	98	151.3	.000
C.	Attended High School in Same District				
1.	Yes	205	92		
2.	No	18	8	153.5	.000
D.	Type of Special Education Program Attended				
1.	Resource	56	46		
2.	Self-Contained	35	29		

3. Work Study	30	25	9.4	.009
E. Major Course of Study				
1. College Prep	33	20		
2. Vocational	132	80	61.0	.000
F. Regular Education				
1. Take Courses in Regular Education?				
a. Yes	179	77		
b. No, not required	38	16		
c. No, I chose not to	5	2		
d. No, courses not offered	10	4	347.5	.000
2. Were the Courses Useful?				
a. Not at all useful	22	13		
b. Somewhat useful	84	48		
c. Very useful	68	39	35.7	.000
G. Special Education				
1. Take courses in Special Education?				
a. Yes	218	95		
b. No, not required	8	3		
c. No, I chose not to	2	1		
d. No, courses not offered	2	1	597.8	.000
2. Were the courses useful?				
a. Not at all useful	21	10		
b. Somewhat useful	77	35		
c. Very useful	119	55	66.8	.000
H. Vocational Education				
1. Take courses in Vocational Education				
a. Yes	182	80		
b. No, not required	21	9		
c. No, I chose not to	19	8		
d. No, courses not offered	6	3	367.8	.000
2. Were the courses useful?				
a. not at all useful	21	12		
b. somewhat useful	55	31		
c. very useful	100	57	53.5	.000
I. Skilled Learned in High School				
1. Was your preparation to live independently:				
a. not at all useful	75	33		
b. somewhat useful	70	31		
c. very useful	83	36	1.1	.568
Do you need those skills now:				
a. not at all need	75	32		
b. somewhat need	53	23		
c. very much need	105	45	17.5	.000
2. Was your preparation to participate in social/community activities:				
a. not at all useful	87	39		
b. somewhat useful	71	32		
c. very useful	66	29	3.2	.200

Do you need these skills now?				
a. not at all need	97	43		
b. somewhat need	65	29		
c. very much need	66	29	8.7	.010
3. Was your preparation to get along with others:				
a. not at all useful	50	22		
b. somewhat useful	62	27		
c. very useful	120	52	36.2	.000
Do you need these skills now?				
a. not at all need	103	45		
b. somewhat need	38	17		
c. very much need	89	39	30.5	.000
4. Was your preparation to understand your abilities?				
a. not at all useful	44	19		
b. somewhat useful	75	33		
c. very useful	109	48	27.8	.000
Do you need these skills now?				
a. not at all need	81	35		
b. somewhat need	65	28		
c. very much need	84	37	2.7	.256
5. Was your preparation to know about different jobs?				
a. not at all useful	57	25		
b. somewhat useful	64	28		
c. very useful	107	47	19.3	.000
Do you need these skills now?				
a. not at all need	74	33		
b. somewhat need	54	24		
c. very much need	99	44	13.4	.001
6. Was your preparation to select the best job for you:				
a. not at all useful	96	42		
b. somewhat useful	69	30		
c. very much useful	63	28	8.1	.017
Do you need these skills now:				
a. Not at all need	81	36		
b. somewhat need	52	23		
c. very much need	92	41	11.4	.003
7. Was your preparation to search, apply and interview for a job:				
a. not at all useful	70	31		
b. somewhat useful	56	25		
c. very much useful	100	44	13.4	.001
Do you need these skills now:				
a. not at all need	93	41		
b. somewhat need	38	17		
c. very much need	95	42	27.8	.000
8. Was your preparation to perform acceptable work:				
a. not at all useful	70	31		
b. somewhat useful	54	24		
c. very much useful	99	44	14.0	.001

Do you need these skills now:				
a. not at all needed	105	48		
b. somewhat needed	24	11		
c. very much needed	89	41	50.7	.000
J. Person(s) most helpful in preparing for the future				
1. Regular Teacher				
a. Yes	79	34		
b. No	153	66	23.6	.000
2. Special Education Teacher				
a. Yes	168	72		
b. No	65	28	45.5	.000
3. Titie I Teacher				
a. Yes	34	15		
b. No	199	85	116.8	.000
4. Vocational Education Teacher				
a. Yes	91	39		
b. No	142	61	11.2	.001
5. Rehabilitation Teacher				
a. Yes	32	14		
b. No	201	86	122.6	.000
6. Work Study Teacher				
a. Yes	66	28		
b. No	167	72	43.8	.000
7. Activities Teacher				
a. Yes	22	9		
b. No	211	91	153.3	.000
8. Coach				
a. Yes	69	30		
b. No	164	70	38.7	.000
9. Principal/Vice Principal				
a. Yes	44	19		
b. No	189	81	90.2	.000
10. Other School Staff				
a. Yes	64	27		
b. No	169	73	47.3	.000
11. Parent of Relatives				
a. Yes	181	78		
b. No	52	22	71.4	.000
12. Friends				
a. Yes	75	32		
b. No	158	68	29.6	.000
13. Job Supervisor				
a. Yes	76	33		
b. No	157	67	28.2	.000
14. All Others				
a. Yes	25	11		
b. No	203	89	138.9	.000

III. POST-SECONDARY SCHOOL EXPERIENCES

A. School

1. Have you taken courses at:				
a. Community/Jr. College	39	18		
b. State College/University	25	13		
c. Vocational/Technical School	17	8		
d. Free University	0	0		
e. Other	30	14		
f. Has not taken courses at all	109	50	18.4	.001

B. Mobility

1. How do you get to work:				
a. Drive car or motorcycle	113	50		
b. Carpool	11	5		
c. Bus	47	21		
d. Bicycle	6	3		
e. Walk	24	11		
f. Taxi	0	0		
g. Other	21	9		
h. Do not get to work	4	2	274.8	.000
2. How do you get to other places:				
a. Drive car or motorcycle	123	53		
b. Carpool	14	6		
c. Bus	38	16		
d. Bicycle	7	3		
e. Walk	13	6		
f. Taxi	0	0		
g. Other	37	16	242.7	.000
3. Do you have auto insurance:				
a. Yes	69	33		
b. No	140	67	24.1	.000

C. Social Life

1. How often do parents visit in one week?				
a. None	101	44		
b. Less than once per week	27	12		
c. 2-4 visits per week	36	16		
d. Over 5 visits per week	63	28	58.4	.000
2. How often do relatives visit in one week?				
a. None	48	21		
b. Less than once per week	103	45		
c. Two to four visits per week	40	17		
d. Over five visits per week	38	16	49.7	.000
3. How often do friends visit in one week?				
a. None	41	18		
b. Less than once per week	56	24		
c. Two to four visits per week	61	26		
d. Over five visits per week	71	31	8.2	.042

4. How often do others visit in one week?				
a. None	170	75		
b. Less than once per week	17	8		
c. Two to four visits per week	21	9		
d. Over five visits per week	18	8	304.2	.000
D. Independence				
1. Dependence on family/social services				
a. Where are you living now?				
1. Own home	15	6		
2. Apartment by self	19	8		
3. Apartment with friends	10	4		
4. With parents/guardians	150	64		
5. With relatives	10	4		
6. In group home	6	3		
7. Other	23	9	483.6	.000
b. Have you used Vocational Rehabilitation Services?				
1. Yes	62	30		
2. No	130	63		
3. Don't know	14	7	98.9	.000
2. Financial Independence				
a. Do you receive money regularly from:				
1. No one	132	59		
2. Parents	42	19		
3. Welfare	15	7		
4. Vocational Rehabilitation	5	2		
5. Social Services	15	7		
6. Other	16	7	306.2	.000
b. Do you currently have money in:				
1. No money applicable	75	33		
2. Savings account	128	56		
3. Checking account	16	7		
4. Other	10	4	164.0	.000
c. Do you make payments on:				
1. No payments	14	50		
2. Car	46	20		
3. Home	30	13		
4. Appliances	8	4		
5. Other	30	13	144.3	.000
d. How do you purchase items?				
1. Do not purchase items	4	2		
2. Barter/trade	4	2		
3. Pay cash	198	85		
4. Use credit card	16	7		
5. Use charge account	10	4		
6. Other	3	1	625.6	.000

E. Work

1. How many jobs have you had				
a. One	26	14		
b. Two	39	20		
c. Three	43	23		
d. Four	37	19		
e. Five	46	24	6.1	.188
2. Are you currently working?				
a. Not employed and not looking	14	6		
b. Unemployed and looking	43	19		
c. Employed	153	69		
d. Homemaker	11	5	241.9	.000
3. How did you find your jobs?				
a. Found yourself	201	29		
b. Parents found	55	8		
c. Relatives found	45	7		
d. Friends found	87	13		
e. Teacher found	112	16		
4. How long do you work (average)				
a. None	196	28		
b. Not working	34	5		
c. Part-time	71	10		
d. Half-time	132	19		
e. Full-time	225	32		
f. Over-time	6			
5. How much did you make?				
a. None	202	30		
b. Under $3/hour	286	43		
c. Under $4/hour	89	14		
d. Under $5/hour	30	5		
e. Under $7/hour	35	5		
f. Under $9/hour	28	4		
6. Did you receive a bonus?				
a. Not applicable	209	31		
b. No	189	28		
c. No, but will in future	28	4		
d. No, others have	14	2		
e. Yes, built into scale	161	24		
f. Yes, based on ability	46	7		
g. Other	20	3		
7. Have you ever had any problems at work regarding:				
a. Not applicable, no	500	72		
b. Doing enough work	63	9		
c. Working all day	27	4		
d. Boss unhappy with you	35	5		
e. People not talking to you	6	1		
f. No verbal rewards	20	3		
g. Other	46	7		

8. Why did you leave your job(s)?				
a. Not applicable	205	30		
b. Quit to take other job	76	11		
c. Quit	113	16		
d. Laid off	90	13		
e. Fired	45	7		
f. Still working	159	23		
9. Do you like your job(s)?				
a. Not applicable	199	29		
b. Not at all	58	8		
c. Somewhat	192	28		
d. Very much	245	35		

F. General Life View

1. How do you feel about your life so far?				
a. Very dissatisfied/unhappy	10	5		
b. dissatisfied/unhappy	17	8		
c. OK, neutral	53	24		
d. Satisfied/happy	70	32		
e. Very satisfied/happy	72	32	77.1	.000

APPENDIX D

I. HIGH SCHOOL PREPARATION CORRELATES

Respondents who found that their high school preparation:

a. to know about different job was very useful were more likely to be employed;

b. for job selection was of little use were more likely to dislike their jobs;

c. for social participation was very useful were more likely to have found their jobs independently; and

d. for social participation was somewhat or very useful were more likely to be happy with their lives.

Respondents who indicated that activity teachers were helpful in preparing them for the future were less likely to report raises on their jobs than those who did not regard the activity teacher to be helpful.

Respondents in college preparation programs were more likely to continue their education after graduation than those in the vocational preparation sequence.

Question: What was the relation between how useful respondents considered their high school preparation to know about different jobs and their current employment status?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Usefulness of High School Preparation to Know About Different Jobs

		Not at All Useful	Somewhat Useful	Very Useful
Employment Status	Unemployed	23.6	43.6	32.7
	Employed	25.0	23.0	52.0

Significance: $x^2 = 9.87$ c = .209
sign. @ .05 level

Findings: Respondents who found their high school preparation to know about different jobs to be "very useful" were more likely to be employed than those who considered their training to be somewhat or not at all useful.

Question: What is the relation between how useful respondents found their high school preparation for job selection and how well they liked their jobs.[2]

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

How Useful Was High School Training

		Not at All Useful	Somewhat/Very Useful
How much like job	Not at all like	81.8	18.2
	Somewhat like	39.9	60.8
	Very much like	39.1	60.9

Significance: $x^2 = 7.85$ c = .186
sign. @ .02 level

Findings: Respondents who did not consider their high school preparation useful for job selection were likely to dislike their jobs.

Question: Was there a relation between how useful respondents considered their high school preparation for social participation and how they found jobs after graduation?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Usefulness of High School's Preparation for Social Participation

		Not at All Useful	Somewhat Useful	Very Useful
How Respondent Found Job	Didn't	60.0	20.0	20.0
	I found	23.9	25.0	51.1
	Parents	13.8	51.7	34.5
	Relatives	20.8	29.2	50.0
	Friends	33.3	19.4	47.2
	Teachers	10.6	21.3	68.1

Significance: $x^2 = 22.67$ $c = .300$
sign. @ .012 level

Findings: Respondents who considered their high school preparation for social participation to be very useful were more likely to have found their jobs themselves or with the help of their teachers, relatives, or friends than those who considered their training to be not at all useful.

Question: Were respondents who considered their high school preparation for social participation useful happy with their lives after graduation?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Usefulness of High School Preparation for Social Participation

		Not at All Useful	Somewhat Useful/ Very Useful
How Happy With Life	Very unhappy	80.0	20.0
	Dissatisfied	50.0	50.0
	OK	41.2	58.8
	Satisfied	30.3	67.7
	Happy	38.6	61.4

Significance: $x^2 = 10.02$ $c = .212$
sign. @ .004 level

Findings: Respondents who found their high school preparation to participate in social activities to be somewhat or very useful were more likely to be happy with their lives than those who viewed their preparation as unsatisfactory.

Question: Did respondents receive a raise?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		No	Yes
Did activity teacher help prepare for future?	No	44.0	56.0
	Yes	68.4	31.6

Significance: $x^2 = 4.11$ $c = .144$
sign. @ .05 level

Findings: Respondents who indicated that activity teachers were helpful in preparing them for th future were less likely to report raises in their jobs than respondents who did not indicat they were helpful.

Question: Did respondents with college prep or vocational majors in high school continue their educa tion after graduation?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Post-Secondary Education

		None	Community or Junior College	State College or University	Vocational/ Technical/ Other School
Type of Major	College Prep	7.4	55.6	37.0	0
	Vocational	11.9	23.9	17.9	46.3

Significance: $x^2 = 12.02$
sign. @ .01 level

Findings: Respondents in college prep programs were more likely to continue their education at junior, community college, state college or university than those in vocational programs wh were more likely to attend an alternative or do nothing.

II. Regular Education Correlates

Respondents who took classes in regular education were:

a. less likely to receive vocational rehabilitation services;

b. less likely to receive money from parents and welfare;

c. less likely to have frequent contacts with relatives after graduation;

d. more likely to have regular contacts with parents after graduation; and

e. more likely to earn more money from jobs.

Question: Did respondents who participated in regular education classes receive vocational rehabilitation services?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Received Vocational Rehabilitation Services

		Yes	No	Don't Know
Courses in Regular Education	Yes	28.7	66.9	4.5
	No	36.2	48.9	14.9

Significance: $x^2 = 8.27$ c = .197
sign. @ .02 level

Findings: Respondents who participated in regular education classes were less likely to receive vocational rehabilitation services than those who did not participate in regular classes.

Question: Did respondents who participated in regular education classes receive money?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Source of Money

		None	Parents	Welfare	Other
Courses in Regular Education	Yes	64.2	16.2	5.2	14.5
	No	42.0	28.0	12.0	18.0

Significance: $x^2 = 9.08$ c = .198
sign. @ .05 level

Findings: Respondents who participated in regular education classes were less likely to receive money from parents and welfare and more likely to receive no money from those sources than those who had not participated in regular classes.

Question: Did respondents who participated in regular education classes have regular contacts with relatives after graduation?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Frequency of Visits with Relatives

		None	Less Than Once/Week	Two to Four/Week	Over Five/ Week
Courses in Regular Education	Yes	17.7	49.7	18.3	14.3
	No	28.8	30.8	15.4	25.0

Signficance: $x^2 = 8.6$ c = .191
sign. @ .05 level

Findings: Respondents who had taken courses in regular education were less likely to have frequent contacts with relatives than those who did not take courses in regular education.

Question: Did respondents who participated in regular education classes have regular contacts with parents after graduation?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Frequency of Visits with Parents

		None	Less Than Once/Week	Two to Four/Week	Over Five/ Week
Courses in Regular Education	Yes	39.1	14.4	14.9	31.9
	No	62.7	2.0	19.6	15.7

Significance: $x^2 = 14.33$ c = .245
sign. @ .01 level

Findings: Respondents who participated in regular classrooms were more likely to have regular contacts with parents after graduation than respondents who had no participation in regular classes.

Question: What were the hourly rates earned in all jobs by all respondents since high school?

Result:

		Percentage of Respondents			
		Under $3/hr.	Under $4/hr.	Under $5/hr.	Over $6/hr.
Courses in Regular Education	Yes	50.3	20.7	9.5	19.5
	No	69.4	8.2	12.2	10.2

Significance: $x^2 = 8.06$ $c = .189$
sign. @ .05 level

Findings: Respondents who had taken classes in regular education were likely to earn more money from jobs than those who had not taken classes in regular education.

III. Usefulness of Regular Education Correlates

Respondents who indicated that their regular education coursework was:

a. useful or very useful were more likely to have car insurance; and

b. not at all or somewhat useful were more likely to use a car or motorcycle for transportation.

Question: Did respondents who found their regular education coursework to be useful indicate that they had car insurance?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Usefulness of Regular Education Coursework

		Not At All Useful	Somewhat Useful	Very Useful
Does respondent have car insurance?	Yes	7.3	36.6	56.1
	No	15.7	52.2	32.2

Significance: $x^2 = 7.59$ c = .215
sign. @ .023 level

Findings: Respondents who regarded their regular education coursework to be very useful were more likely to have car insurance.

Question: Were respondents who found their regular education coursework to be useful mobile after graduation?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Methods of Transportation

		Car/Motor-cycle	Carpool	Bus	Walk	Other
Usefulness of Regular Education Coursework	Not at all/ Somewhat useful	63.8	7.6	7.6	5.7	15.2
	Very useful	47.1	4.4	25.0	4.4	19.1

Significance: $x^2 = 11.8$ c = .253
sign. @ .02 level

Findings: Respondents who regarded regular education coursework not at all or somewhat useful were more likely to use a car or motorcycle and less likely to use a bus than those who regarded regular coursework to be very useful.

IV. Usefulness of Vocational Education Correlates

Respondents who found vocational education classes to be useful or very useful were more likely to work overtime on their jobs and to have frequent contacts with friends.

Question: Did respondents who found vocational education classes very useful work more than those who didn't?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Hours Worked

		Not Working	Part-time	Half-time	Full-time	Over-time
Usefulness of Vocational Classes	Not at all/ Somewhat Useful	1.4	8.3	19.4	66.7	5.6
	Very Useful	0.0	13.1	6.1	63.6	17.2

Significance: $x^2 = 13.22$ $c = .267$
sign. @ .02 level

Findings: Respondents who found vocational education classes very useful were more likely to work overtime than those who were less satisfied with vocational education classes.

Question: Did respondents who found vocational education to be useful have regular contacts with friends after graduation.[2]

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Usefulness of Vocational Education

		Not At All Useful	Somewhat Useful	Very Useful
Frequency of Visits with Friends	None	14.8	11.1	74.1
	Less than once/week	6.8	47.7	45.5
	Two to four/ week	11.3	35.8	52.8
	More than five/week	14.6	22.9	62.5

Significance: $x^2 = 13.01$ $c = .265$
sign. @ .043 level

Findings: Respondents who found vocational education to be very useful were more likely to have frequent contacts with friends.

V. Training Needs Correlates

Respondents who expressed that they somewhat or very much needed:

a. additional training in performing acceptable work were more likely to be working part time or overtime;

b. to know how to select the best job for them were more likely to depend upon their parents to find their jobs for them;

c. to be able to select the job best suited for them were more likely to be working overtime;

d. to know more about different jobs were more likely to be working part time or overtime; and

e. to know about different jobs are more likely to depend upon friends and parents to find jobs for them.

Question: What was the relation between how much respondents needed to know how to perform acceptable work and how much they worked at jobs since graduation.[2]

Result:

Percentage of Respondents
How Much Need

		Not At All Need	Somewhat/Very Much Need
How Much Work	Not Working	100.0	0.0
	Part time	26.1	73.9
	Half time	60.7	39.3
	Full time	54.2	45.8
	Overtime	21.4	78.6

Significance: $x^2 = 18.3$ $c = .28$
sign. @ .01 level

Findings: Respondents who somewhat or very much needed additional training in performing acceptable work were more likely to be working part-time or overtime.

Question: What was the relation between how much respondents currently needed training to select the best jobs for them and how they found jobs since high school?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

How Much Need to Select Best Job

		Not At All Need	Somewhat Need	Very Much Need
How Found Job	Did not find	50.0	50.0	0
	I found	40.9	18.2	40.9
	Parents	14.8	33.3	51.9
	Relative	37.5	33.3	29.2
	Friends	31.4	11.4	57.1
	Teacher	40.9	29.5	29.5

Significance: $x^2 = 18.85$ $c = .280$
sign. @ .04 level

Findings: Respondents who very much needed to know how to select the best job for them were more likely to depend upon parents to find their jobs.

Question: What was the relation between how much respondents currently needed training to select best job for them and how much they worked?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

How Much Need to Select Best Job

		Not At All Need	Somewhat Need	Very Much
How much work	Part time	33.3	12.5	54.2
	Half time	53.3	23.3	23.3
	Full time	36.6	23.1	40.3
	Overtime	13.3	30.0	56.7

Significance: $x^2 = 13.73$ c = .243
sign. @ .05 level

Findings: Respondents who somewhat or very much needed to select the best job for them were more likely to be working overtime.

Question: What was the relation between how much the respondents currently needed to know about different jobs and how much they worked in jobs since graduation.

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

How Much Need to Know About Different Jobs

		Not At All Need	Somewhat Need	Very Much Need
How much work	Part time	33.3	12.5	54.2
	Half time	53.3	16.7	30.0
	Full time	31.9	27.4	40.7
	Overtime	6.7	26.7	66.7

Significance: $x^2 = 18.84$ c = .281
sign. @ .01 level

Findings: Respondents who very much needed to know more about different jobs were more likely to be working part time or overtime.

Question: What was the relation between how much the respondents currently needed to know about different jobs and how they found jobs since graduation?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

How Much Need to Know About Different Jobs

		Not At All Need	Somewhat Need	Very Much Need
How found job	Didn't find	60.0	20.0	20.0
	I found	37.5	17.0	45.5
	Parents	14.3	39.3	46.4
	Relatives	37.5	29.2	33.3
	Friends	25.7	8.6	65.7
	Teacher	34.1	36.4	29.5

Significance: $x^2 = 23.85$ $c = .310$
sign. @ .008 level

Findings: Respondents who somewhat or very much needed to know about different jobs were more likely to depend on friends and parents to find them jobs than any other source.

VI. Sex Correlates

Male respondents were more likely to need help understanding their own abilities, to have taken classes in regular education, to be still working or to have quit to take another job, to receive bonuses for working, and to drive to work and other places than female respondents.

Female respondents were more likely to be married, earn less than $4/hour, be out of work or working part or half time, and to get to work and other places by carpool, bus, or walking than male respondents.

Question: Did male and female respondents need help understanding their own abilities, talents and interests?

Result:

		Percentage of Respondents		
		Not At All Need	Somewhat Need	Very Much Need
Sex	Male	29.3	30.6	40.1
	Female	46.3	23.8	30.0

Significance: $x^2 = 6.56$ c = .168
sign. @ .038 level

Findings: Male respondents were more likely to need help understanding their own abilities than female respondents.

Question: Did male and female respondents take courses in regular education?

Result:

		Percentage of Respondents	
		Yes	No
Sex	Male	81.8	18.2
	Female	67.9	32.1

Significance: $x^2 = 5.61$ c = .21
sign. @ .02 level

Findings: Male respondents were more likely to have taken classes in regular education than female respondents.

Question: Why did respondents leave their jobs?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Quit To Take Other Job	Quit	Laid Off	Fired	Still Working
Sex	Male	17.3	18.3	18.6	9.6	36.2
	Female	13.4	32.3	18.9	7.9	27.4

Significance: $x^2 = 13.04$ c = .163
sign. @ .02 level

Findings: Male respondents were more likely to be still working, or to have quit their jobs to take another job than female respondents who were more likely to have simply quit their jobs.

Question: Did respondents receive bonuses in jobs held since high school?

Results:

Percentage of Respondents

		No	No, In Future	No, Others Have	Yes, Built In	Yes, Based on Ability	Other
Sex	Male	34.7	6.0	3.0	39.7	11.3	5.0
	Female	52.7	6.7	3.3	26.7	7.3	3.3

Significance: $x^2 = 15.32$ c = .18
sign. @ .01 level

Findings: Male respondents were more likely to receive a bonus than female respondents.

Question: How did respondents usually get places?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Car or Motorcycle	Carpool	Bus	Walk	Other
Sex	Male	63.9	4.8	12.2	4.1	14.9
	Female	34.1	8.5	23.2	8.5	25.6

Significance: $x^2 = 18.91$ c = .2762
sign. @ .001 level

Finding: Female respondents were more likely to get to places by carpool, bus, walk or other means than males who were more likely to drive.

Question: How did respondents usually get to work?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Car Motorcycle	Carpool	Bus	Walk	Oth
Sex	Male	61.4	3.4	15.9	6.9	12.
	Female	30.1	8.0	32.0	17.3	12.

Significance: $x^2 = 22.39$ c = .304
sign. @ .001 level

Findings: Female respondents were more likely to get to work by carpool, bus, or walk than ma respondents who were more likely to drive.

Question: What proportion of the male and female respondents were married?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Married	Single
Sex	Male	15.5	84.5
	Female	27.8	72.2

Significance: $x^2 = 4.86$ c = .147
sign. @ .05 level

Findings: Female respondents were more likely to be married than male respondents.

Question: How much did respondents earn on jobs held since high school?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Hourly Rate

		None	Less Than $3/hr.	Less Than $4/hr.	Less Than $5/hr.	Less Than $7/hr.	Less Than $9/hr.
Sex	Male	28.8	39.3	15.6	4.7	6.0	5.6
	Female	33.3	48.5	9.1	3.9	3.9	1.3

Significance: $x^2 = 16.99$ c = .158
sign. @ .01 level

Findings: Female respondents were more likely to earn less than $4 per hour than male respondents who were more likely to earn over $5/hour.

Question: How long did respondents work at jobs held since high school?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Time Worked

		None	Part-time	Half-time	Full-time	Over-time
Sex	Male	31.4	8.9	16.8	35.0	8.1
	Female	36.2	12.3	22.6	27.2	1.6

Significance: $x^2 = 19.8$ c = .19
sign. @ .001

Findings: Female respondents were more likely to be not working, working part-time or half-time than male respondents who were more likely to be working full-time or overtime.

VII. Age Correlates

The older respondents in this sample were more likely to be physically handicapped, to consider their high school preparation for social participation and for working well on the job to be very useful to indicate that their work study teachers were helpful, to be out of work and to be financially dependent upon others for support than younger respondents.

Younger respondents were more likely to be classified emotionally/behaviorally disturbed, to indicate that their parents, relatives, and friends were helpful in preparing them for the future, to be employed and earning an income, to rely upon themselves to find jobs, and to receive bonuses for working than older respondents.

Question: What was the proportion of respondents' handicapping conditions by age?

Percentage of Respondents

		MR	EBD	P/C	Physical
Age Categories*	1	33.3	25.0	27.8	13.9
	2	31.9	14.5	30.4	23.2
	3	42.0	11.6	36.2	10.1
	4	33.3	3.7	22.2	44.7

Significance: $x^2 = 18.5$ c = .29
sign. @ .03 level

Findings: The frequency of EBD respondents decreased and the frequency of physically handicapped respondents increased with age.

Question: Did respondents of different ages find that their high school preparation for participating in social or community activities was useful?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Not At All Useful	Somewhat Useful	Very Useful
Age Categories	1	37.2	34.9	27.9
	2	40.8	39.5	19.7
	3	41.9	29.7	28.4
	4	30.0	13.3	56.7

Significance: $x^2 = 15.86$ c = .258
sign. @ .015 level

Findings: Older respondents were more likely to consider their high school preparation for social participating to be very useful than younger respondents.

* 1 = 19-20 years 2 = 21-22 years 3 = 23-24 years 4 = 25-27 years

Question: How useful were respondents' high school preparation to work well on a job?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Not At All Useful	Somewhat Useful	Very Useful
Age Categories	1	19.5	34.1	46.3
	2	29.5	30.8	39.7
	3	41.3	14.7	44.0
	4	28.6	14.3	57.1

Significance: $x^2 = 12.89$ c = .234
sign. @ .045 level

Findings: Older respondents were more likely to view their high school preparation to work well as not at all useful than younger respondents.

Question: Did respondents indicate that their work study teacher was helpful in preparing them for the future?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Yes	No
Age Categories	1	29.5	70.5
	2	18.8	81.3
	3	39.5	60.5
	4	25.0	75.0

Significance: $x^2 = 8.45$ c = .187
sign. @ .038 level

Findings: Older respondents were more likely to indicate that work study teachers were more helpful than younger respondents.

Question: How long did respondents work at jobs held since high school?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Not Working	Part-time	Half-time	Full-time	Overtime
Age Categories	1	31.3	7.6	19.1	35.1	6.9
	2	26.9	12.2	21.4	33.6	5.9
	3	31.3	10.0	19.1	33.5	6.1
	4	55.2	8.3	11.5	21.9	3.1

Significance: $x^2 = 28.32$ c = .197
sign. @ .02 level

Findings: Older respondents were more likely to be not working and less likely to be working full-time than younger students.

Question: Do you regularly receive money from parents and others?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		No	Parents	Others
Age Categories	1	64.3	19.0	16.7
	2	67.5	14.3	18.2
	3	58.9	21.9	19.2
	4	28.1	21.9	50.0

Significance: $x^2 = 19.98$ c = .286
sign. @ .01 level

Findings: Older respondents were less likely to be financially independent and more likely to receive regular support from parents and other sources.

Question: Did respondents indicate that their parents or relatives were helpful in preparing them for the future?

Result:

		Percentage of Respondents	
		Yes	No
Age Categories	1	81.8	18.2
	2	77.5	22.5
	3	84.2	15.8
	4	56.3	43.8

Significance: $x^2 = 10.75$ c = .210
sign. @ .013 level

Findings: Younger respondents were more likely to indicate that their parents and relatives were helpful in preparing them for the future than older respondents.

Question: Did respondents indicate that their friends were helpful in preparing them for the future?

Result:

		Percentage of Respondents	
		Yes	No
Age Categories	1	31.8	68.2
	2	36.3	63.8
	3	38.2	61.8
	4	9.4	90.6

Significance: $x^2 = 9.45$ c = .198
sign. @ .024 level

Findings: Younger respondents were more likely to indicate that their friends were helpful in preparing them for the future than older respondents.

Question: How much did the respondent earn in jobs held since high school?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Hourly Rate

		None	Less Than $3/hr.	Less Than $4/hr.	Less Than $5/hr.	Less Than $6/hr.	Less Than $7/hr.
Age Categories	1	28.7	44.2	16.3	3.9	2.3	4.7
	2	23.4	45.1	14.9	5.5	6.0	5.1
	3	28.6	43.5	11.2	3.1	7.5	4.2
	4	55.1	31.5	.3	3.1	6.3	3.3

Significance: $x^2 = 39.89$ c = .238
sign. @ .001 level

Findings: Younger respondents were more likely to earn money for working than older respondents.

Question: How did respondents find the jobs held since high school?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		I Found	Parents Found	Relatives Found	Friends Found	Teacher Found
Age Categories	1	46.8	10.6	7.4	10.6	24.5
	2	47.3	9.0	8.5	17.6	17.6
	3	31.5	13.7	11.3	20.2	23.2
	4	31.9	10.6	6.4	14.9	36.2

Significance: $x^2 = 20.27$ c = .198
sign. @ .001 level

Findings: Younger respondents were more likely to rely upon themselves to find jobs than older respondents who were more likely to depend upon friends and teachers.

Question: Did respondents receive bonuses in jobs held since high school?

Result:

		Percentage of Respondents	
		No	Yes
Age Categories	1	47.1	52.9
	2	55.8	44.2
	3	51.4	48.6
	4	55.3	44.7

Significance: $x^2 = 37.11$ c = .236
sign. @ .001 level

Findings: Younger respondents were more likely to receive bonuses than older respondents.

VIII. Urban/Rural Correlates

Urban respondents were more likely: to need training on how to search for the best job for them and how to get along with others, to have been in a resource or self-contained classroom than a work study program, to be still working, to have quit, or to have quit to find another job, to receive bonuses for working, to have held a greater number of jobs since high school, and to indicate that their parents or relatives were helpful in preparing them for the future than rural respondents.

Rural respondents were more likely to indicate that courses in regular education were useful and to have been raised by both their mothers and fathers than urban respondents.

Question: Did urban and rural respondents currently need more training on how to search for the best job for them?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Not At All Need	Somewhat Need	Very Much Need
Type of Residence	Urban	30.8	30.0	39.2
	Rural	41.9	14.0	44.1

Significance: $x^2 = 8.186$ c = .188
sign. @ .017 level

Findings: Urban respondents were more likely to need more training now on how to search for the best job for them than rural respondents.

Questions: Did urban and rural respondents currently need training on how to get along with others?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Not At All Need	Somewhat Need	Very Much Need
Type of Residence	Urban	40.6	12.8	46.6
	Rural	50.5	22.1	27.4

Significance: $x^2 = 9.43$ c = .199
sign. @ .009 level

Findings: Urban respondents were more likely to need training now on how to get along with others than rural respondents.

Question: What was the relation between urban/rural respondents and the educational program they experienced in high school?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Type of Educational Program

		Resource	Self-Contained	Work-Study
Type of Residence	Urban	45.6	38.0	16.5
	Rural	14.6	12.7	39.7

Significance: $x^2 = 15.47$ c = .31
sign. @ .001

Findings: Urban respondents were more likely to have been in a resource or self-contained classroom than rural respondents who were more likely to have been in a work study program.

Question: Why did the respondents leave their jobs?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Quit To Take Other Job	Quit	Laid Off	Fired	Still Working
Type of Residence	Urban	16.6	25.5	15.1	7.0	35.8
	Rural	14.9	20.7	23.6	12.0	28.8

Significance: $x^2 = 11.64$ c = .129
sign. @ .05 level

Findings: Urban respondents were more likely to be still working, to have quit, or to have quit to find another job than rural respondents who were more likely to have been laid off or fired.

Question: Did the respondents receive any bonuses from jobs held since high school?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		No	No, In Future	No, Others Have	Yes, Built In	Yes, Based On Ability	Other
Type of Residence	Urban	38.2	4.6	3.1	37.8	12.7	3.5
	Rural	45.9	8.2	3.1	30.9	6.2	5.7

Significance: $x^2 = 11.33$ c = .156
sign. @ .05 level

Findings: Urban respondents were more likely to receive bonuses than rural respondents.

Questions: How many jobs have respondents held since high school?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Number of Jobs Held

		1	2	3	4	5
Type of Residence	Urban	14.3	21.0	21.9	25.7	17.1
	Rural	11.9	20.2	23.8	10.7	33.3

Significance: $x^2 = 10.82$ c = .233
sign. @ .029 level

Findings: Respondents from urban communities were more likely to have held a greater number of jobs since high school than those from rural communities.

Question: Did respondents indicate that their parents or relatives were helpful in preparing them for the future?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Yes	No
Type of Residence	Urban	84.1	15.9
	Rural	69.7	30.3

Significance: $x^2 = 6.81$ c = .169
sign. @ .014 level

Findings: Urban respondents were more likely to indicate that their parents or relatives were helpful in preparing them for the future than rural respondents.

Question: Did urban and rural respondents find that the courses they took in regular education were useful?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Not At All Useful	Somewhat Useful	Very Useful
Type of Residence	Urban	18.0	42.0	40.0
	Rural	5.5	57.5	37.0

Significance: $x^2 = 7.39$ c = .203
sign. @ .025 level

Findings: Rural respondents were more likely to indicate that courses in regular education were somewhat or very useful than urban respondents.

Question: Who raised urban and rural respondents?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Who Raised?

		Mother	Father	Mother & Father
Type of Residence	Urban	22.8	7.1	70.1
	Rural	8.4	7.4	84.4

Significance: $x^2 = 8.2$ c = .187
sign. @ .02 level

Findings: Rural respondents were more likely to be raised by both mother and father than urban respondents.

IX. Special Education Program Correlates

Respondents from resource classrooms were more likely to be diagnosed as perceptual communicative disordered and to have taken classes in regular education than respondents from self-contained or work study programs.

Respondents from resource and self-contained classrooms were more likely to receive a regular high school diploma, to be still working, to have quit to take other jobs, or simply to have quit, to find their preparation for job interviewing to be useful, to need training in identifying appropriate jobs, and to have held more jobs since high school than respondents from work study programs.

Respondents from resource and work study programs were more likely to have found jobs themselves and to indicate that activities teachers were not helpful in preparing them for the future than respondents from self-contained classrooms.

Respondents from self-contained and work study programs were more likely to use vocational rehabilitation services, to rely upon teachers to find jobs, and to be fired from their jobs than respondents from resource classrooms.

Respondents from work study programs were more likely to visit or receive visits from relatives than those from self-contained or resource rooms. They were also more likely to take regular education classes than respondents from self-contained classrooms.

Respondents from self-contained classrooms were relatively more positive about help they received from activities teachers than respondents from resource or work study programs.

Question: What was the relation between type of handicap and the respondent's educational experience?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Type of Handicap

		Mentally Retarded	Emotionally/ Behaviorally Disturbed	Perceptual/ Communication Disordered	Physical
Type of Educational Program	Resource	19.7	10.6	57.6	12.1
	Self-Contained	71.1	13.2	5.3	10.5
	Work Study	47.4	28.9	13.2	10.5

Significance: $x^2 = 47.94$ c = .502
sign. @ .001 level

Findings: Resource classrooms were more likely to have had P/C respondents as students, while self-contained and work study programs were more likely to have had MR students as respondents.

Question: Did respondents with different educational experiences take courses in regular education?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Yes	No
Type of Educational Program	Resource	90.9	9.1
	Self-Contained	65.8	34.2
	Work Study	73.7	26.3

Significance: $x^2 = 10.47$ c = .262
sign. @ .01 level

Findings: Respondents from resource classrooms were more likely than those from self-contained or work study programs to take classes in regular education. Respondents from work study programs were more likely to take regular education classes than respondents from self-contained classrooms.

Question: What kind of graduation certificate did respondents with different educational experiences receive?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Regular Diploma	Special Diploma
Type of Educational Program	Resource	93.9	6.1
	Self-Contained	89.5	10.5
	Work Study	71.1	28.9

Significance: $x^2 = 11.26$ c = .271
sign. @ .01 level

Findings: Respondents from resource and self-contained classrooms were more likely to receive a regular diploma than those from work study programs.

Question: Why did respondents leave their jobs?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Quit To Take Other Job	Quit	Laid Off	Fired	Still Working
Type of Educational Program	Resource	20.9	25.4	15.7	5.2	32.8
	Self-Contained	17.1	18.6	22.9	11.4	30.0
	Work Study	10.3	13.8	36.2	12.1	27.6

Significance: $x^2 = 16.85$ c = .247
sign. @ .05 level

Findings: Respondents from resource and self-contained rooms were more likely to be still working, to have quit to take other jobs, or simply to have quit than those from work study programs, who were more likely to have been laid off. Respondents from self-contained and work study programs were more likely to be fired than respondents from resource rooms.

Question: How useful were respondents' high school preparation for job interviews?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Not At All Useful	Somewhat Useful	Very Useful
Type of Educational Program	Resource	29.2	30.8	40.0
	Self-Contained	10.8	40.5	48.6
	Work Study	34.2	10.5	55.3

Significance: $x^2 = 12.26$ $c = .284$
sign. @ .02 level

Findings: Respondents from resource and self-contained classrooms were more likely to find their preparation for job interviewing to be useful than respondents from work study programs.

Question: Did respondents need more preparation about identifying the jobs best suited for them?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Not At All Need	Somewhat Need	Very Much Need
Type of Education Program	Resource	38.5	10.8	50.8
	Self-Contained	24.3	35.1	40.5
	Work Study	52.6	18.4	28.9

Significance: $x^2 = 13.91$ $c = .301$
sign. @ .01 level

Findings: Respondents from resource and self-contained classrooms were more likely to need training in identifying appropriate jobs than respondents from work study programs.

Question: How many jobs did respondents hold since high school?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Number of Jobs Held

		1	2	3	4	5
Type of Educational Program	Resource	7.4	18.5	22.2	29.6	22.2
	Self-Contained	21.9	9.4	31.3	21.9	15.6
	Work Study	19.4	32.3	12.9	6.5	29.0

Significance: $x^2 = 16.45$ c = .351
sign. @ .05 level

Findings: Respondents from resource rooms and self-contained classrooms were likely to have held more jobs since high school than respondents from work study programs.

Question: How did respondents find jobs held since high school?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		I Found	Parents	Relatives	Friends	Teachers
Type of Educational Program	Resource	41.9	12.5	9.6	22.8	13.2
	Self-Contained	29.3	6.7	14.7	12.0	37.3
	Work Study	48.5	9.1	4.5	9.1	28.5

Significance: $x^2 = 28.2$ c = .304
sign. @ .001 level

Findings: Respondents from resource and work study programs were more likely to find jobs themselves than respondents from self-contained classrooms. Respondents from self-contained and work study programs relied more upon teachers to find jobs than did respondents from resource classrooms.

Question: Have respondents ever used Vocational Rehabilitation Services or counselors?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Yes	No	Don't Know
Type of Educational Program	Resource	13.5	76.9	9.6
	Self-Contained	31.4	54.3	14.3
	Work Study	36.1	61.1	2.8

Significance: $x^2 = 9.56$ c = .269
sign. @ .05 level

Findings: Respondents from self-contained and work study programs were more likely to use vocational rehabilitation services than those graduating from resource classrooms.

Question: How often did respondents visit or receive visits each week from relatives?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		None	Less Than Once A Week	2 to 4 Visits Per Week	Over 5 Visits Per Week
Type of Educational Program	Resource	18.8	53.1	18.8	9.4
	Self-Contained	33.3	38.9	11.1	16.7
	Work Study	5.3	36.8	31.6	26.3

Significance: $x^2 = 17.8$ c = .338
sign. @ .01 level

Findings: Respondents from work study programs were more likely to visit or receive visits from relatives than those from self-contained or resource rooms.

estion: Did respondents indicate that their activities teacher was helpful in preparing them for the future?

sult:

Percentage of Respondents

		Yes	No
Type of Educational Program	Resource	10.8	89.2
	Self Contained	23.7	76.3
	Work Study	2.6	97.4

gnificance: $x^2 = 8.14$ $c = .233$
sign. @ .02 level

ndings: Respondents from work study programs were more likely to indicate that activities teachers were not helpful in preparing them for the future than respondents from resource classrooms or self-contained classrooms. Respondents from self-contained classrooms were relatively more positive about help received from activities teachers.

P/C respondents were more likely to receive a regular high school diploma, find special education very useful, indicate that their parents were helpful in preparing them for the future, receive bonuses on their jobs, and earn more than $3/hour than respondents with other handicaps. P/C respondents were more likely to be in a resource room and to depend upon their friends to find jobs than EBD or mentally retarded respondents; to be working than physically handicapped or mentally retarded respondents; to indicate a need for training in getting along with others and to be in a vocational program than EBD or physically handicapped respondents; and to find jobs independently (by self) than mentally retarded respondents.

Physically handicapped respondents were more likely to be in a resource room, and to depend upon their friends to find jobs than EBD or mentally retarded respondents; to take regular education classes than mentally retarded respondents; to find jobs independently (by self) than P/C or mentally retarded respondents. They were less likely to indicate that work study teachers helped them prepare for the future than respondents with other handicaps; and less likely to indicate that their parents were helpful in preparing them for the future than EBD or mentally retarded respondents.

Mentally retarded respondents were more likely to be from self-contained classes or work study programs than from a resource classroom; to indicate a need for training in getting along with others and to have been in a vocational program than EBD or physically handicapped respondents; and to indicate that work study teachers were helpful in preparing them for the future than respondents with other handicaps.

EBD respondents were more likely to take classes in regular education than mentally retarded or physically handicapped respondents; to be from a work study program rather than a resource or self-contained classroom; to find jobs independently (by self) than P/C or mentally retarded respondents; and to be working than respondents with other handicaps. They were less likely to find special education to have been very useful than respondents with other handicaps.

Question: What kind of graduation certificate did respondents with different handicapping conditions receive?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Regular Diploma	Special Certificate
Type of Handicap	Mentally Retarded	81.7	18.3
	Emotionally & Behaviorally Disturbed	75.9	24.1
	Perceptual Communication Disordered	96.7	3.2
	Physically Handicapped	81.6	18.4

Significance: $x^2 = 9.83$ c = .216
sign. @ .05 level

Findings: P/C respondents were more likely to receive a regular diploma than respondents with other handicapping conditions.

Questions: Did respondents with different handicapping conditions find their coursework in special education useful?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Not At All/ Somewhat Useful	Very Useful
Type of Handicap	Mental Retardation	44.9	55.1
	Emotional/ Behaviorally Disturbed	65.4	34.6
	Perceptual/ Communication Disordered	32.2	67.8
	Physically Handicapped	48.5	51.5

Significance: $x^2 = 8.42$ c = .208
sign. @ .05 level

Findings: P/C respondents were more likely and EBD respondents less likely to find special education very useful than MR or physically handicapped respondents.

Question: Did respondents indicate that their parents or relatives were helpful in preparing them for the future?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Yes	No
Type of Handicap	Mentally Retarded	76.4	23.6
	Emotionally & Behaviorally Disturbed	75.9	24.1
	Perceptual Communication Disordered	88.5	11.5
	Physical Handicap	53.8	46.2

Significance: $x^2 = 15.56$ c = .268
sign. @ .0014 level

Findings: P/C respondents were more likely and physically handicapped respondents less likely to indicate that their parents were helpful in preparing them for the future than EBD and MR respondents.

Question: Did the respondents receive any bonuses from jobs held since high school?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		No	No, in future	Yes	Yes, based on ability
Type of Handicap	Mentally Retarded	54.4	3.3	27.6	14.6
	Emotionaly & Behaviorally Disturbed	58.8	3.9	27.5	9.8
	Perceptual Communication Disordered	40.1	7.4	39.3	13.1
	Physically Handicapped	43.1	13.8	36.2	6.9

Significance: $x^2 = 77.02$ c = .21
sign. @ .001 level

Findings: P/C respondents were more likely to receive bonuses on their jobs than respondents with other handicaps.

estion: How much did respondents earn on jobs held since high school?

sult:

Percentage of Respondents

Hourly Rate

		None	Less than $3/hour	Less than $4/hour	Less than $5/hour	Less than $7/hour	Over $9/hour
pe of ndicap	Mentally Retarded	34.4	45.5	7.9	3.7	3.7	4.8
	Emotionally & Behaviorally Disturbed	15.6	59.4	12.5	4.7	3.1	4.9
	Perceptual Communication Disordered	23.4	38.3	19.4	5.7	9.7	3.4
	Physically Handicapped	37.6	40.6	10.9	7.9	2.0	1.0

gnificance: $x^2 = 40.32$ c = .27
sign. @ .001 level

ndings: P/C respondents were less likely to be earning nothing or less than $3/hour and more likely to be earning greater than $3/hour than respondents with other handicaps.

uestion: Did respondents with different handicapping conditions need more training on how to get along with others?

esult:

Percentage of Respondents

		Not At All Need	Somewhat Need	Very much Need
ype of andicap	Mentally Retarded	36.6	19.7	43.7
	Emotionally/ Behaviorally Disturbed	55.2	10.3	34.5
	Perceptual Communication Disordered	36.1	13.1	50.8
	Physically Handicapped	64.9	13.5	21.6

ignificance: $x^2 = 13.12$ c = .249
sign. @ .041 level

ndings: P/C and mentally retarded respondents were more likely to indicate a need for training in getting along with others than EBD and physically handicapped students who were more likely to indicate they did not need such training.

Question: How did respondents find jobs held since high school?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		I Found	Parents	Relatives	Friends	Teacher
Type of Handicap	Mentally Retarded	28.5	8.0	11.7	8.8	43.1
	Emotionally & Behaviorally Disturbed	59.6	10.5	0	19.3	10.5
	Perceptual Communication Disordered	38.7	12.7	9.2	28.2	11.3
	Physically Handicapped	47.7	6.2	10.8	2.0	15.4

Significance: $x^2 = 72.58$ c = .39
sign. @ .001 level

Findings: Physically and emotionally handicapped respondents were more likely to find jobs independently (by self) than P/C respondents who in turn were more likely to be independent in their searches than MR respondents, who were more likely to depend on their teachers. EBD, P/C, and physically handicapped respondents were more likely to depend on their friends than MR respondents.

Question: What is the relation between educational experience and the respondents' handicapping condition?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Resource	Self Contained	Work Study
Type of Handicap	Mentally Retarded	22.4	46.6	47.4
	Emotionally & Behaviorally Disturbed	30.4	21.7	47.8
	Perceptual Communication Disordered	84.4	4.4	11.0
	Physically Handicapped	50.0	25.0	25.0

Significance: $x^2 = 47.94$ c = .502
sign. @ .001 level

Findings: Physically handicapped and P/C respondents were more likely to be in resource rooms. EBD respondents were more likely to be in work study programs, while MR respondents were about equally likely to be in self-contained classrooms or work study programs.

Question: Did respondents indicate that their work space study teacher was helpful in preparing them for the future?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Yes	No
Type of Handicap	Mentally Retarded	43.1	56.9
	Emotionally & Behaviorally Disturbed	27.6	72.4
	Perceptual Communication Disordered	26.2	73.8
	Physical Handicapped	10.3	89.7

Significance: $x^2 = 13.70$ c = .253
sign. @ .003 level

Findings: Mentally retarded respondents were more likely to indicate work study teachers were helpful in preparing them for the future than respondents with other handicaps. Physically handicapped respondents were less likely than other respondents to indicate help from work study teachers.

Question: What was the program of study for respondents with different handicapping conditions?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

Course of Study

		College Prep.	Vocational
Type of Handicap	Mentally Retarded	5.6	94.4
	Emotionally & Behaviorally Disturbed	35.7	64.3
	Perceptual Communication Disordered	18.8	81.3
	Physically Handicapped	35.7	64.3

Significance: $x^2 = 14.11$ c = .299
sign. @ .003 level

Findings: MR and P/C respondents were more likely to be in a vocational program than EBD or physically handicapped respondents who were more likely to be in a college prep. program.

Question: Did respondents with different handicapping conditions take courses in regular educati

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Yes	No
Type of Handicap	Mentally Retarded	60.6	39.4
	Emotionally & Behaviorally Disturbed	89.7	10.3
	Perceptual Communication Disordered	88.7	11.3
	Physically Handicapped	73.7	26.3

Significance: $x^2 = 17.84$ c = .286
sign. @ .286

Findings: EBD and P/C respondents were more likely than physically handicapped or mentally retar respondents to take classes in regular education. Physically handicapped respondents w more likely to take regular education classes than mentally retarded respondents.

Question: How long did respondents work in jobs held since high school?

Result:

Percentage of Respondents

		Not working	Part time	Half time	Full time	Over-time
Type of Handicap	Mentally Retarded	40.0	9.4	16.8	30.7	3.0
	Emotionally & Behaviorally Disturbed	19.7	25.8	25.8	27.3	1.5
	Perceptual Communication Disorder	25.6	7.8	20.6	33.9	12.2
	Physically Handicapped	38.1	9.5	20.0	29.5	2.9

Significance: $x^2 = 51.5$ c = .297
sign. @ .001 level

Findings: EBD respondents were more likely to be working than P/C respondents who were more li to be working than physically handicapped or mentally retarded respondents.